Islamic Education

Khosrow Bagheri Noaparast

First published 2001

Alhoda Publishers

Iran-Tehran

ISBN: 964-472-328-7

Foreword

Ethical education is one of the first and foremost objectives of all religions including the religion of Islam. Besides its ethical and moral teachings that are meant to provide man with a sound and perfect belief system, Islam offers man both a theoretical and a practical program for education and moral training and fresh interpretations of these teachings can prove to be very beneficial for the present day human society.

This research-based book is an attempt to provide the readers with pure and solid foundations, principles, and methods of education by relying on the views of the Qur’an on human nature and by clarifying the Islamic concept of education.

The author, Khosrow Bagheri (Ph.D), has a doctorate in education from the N.S.W. University. Australia, and is currently teaching at the Tehran

University. He is well acquainted with Islamic concepts and foundations and is regarded as one of the most successful scholars in the field of education in Iran. This book is the result of his sincere efforts and endeavors as well as years of experience in this field.

We are thankful to Dr. Bagheri, and Mr. Sa'id Edalat Nezhad, the Director of Department of Islamic studies for their efforts and unflinching support in making this work possible. We are also thankful to Mr. Ja'far Muhibbullath from Canada for accepting the laborious task of editing the manuscript of this book.

Center of Cultural & International Studies

Introduction

Islamic education is, undoubtedly, a basic part of the Islamic teachings, but, certainly, a principled inquiry about it still needs to be met. Even though a good amount of good work has been done in this area, Islamic education is not still a serious and considerable discussion. This requires that inquirers undertake hard work in this area and present a systematic account of what is called Islamic education.

Such a purpose, surely, could not be achieved by advancing a few articles and books. What is needed, rather, is a continuous and persistent attempt. In order to do this, one must be quite familiar with Islamic texts, as well as with contemporary educational thought to know what kind of inquiry and problems he or she deals with. It seems that the results must be assessed by the following criteria:

First, validity is important. In discussing Islamic education, the main ideas must be taken form the Islamic text. This is necessary particularly because we hold familiarity with contemporary educational thoughts as p precondition. This familiarity might give form and content to the inquirer's thoughts so that he or she holds unacceptable interpretations of the contents of Islamic texts. This, undoubtedly, affects validity of the work. However, the purpose of becoming familiar with contemporary thoughts is that the

inquirer be present in the proper sphere of the inquiry and use it as an investment for understanding the contents of Islamic text. In other words, this must provide a better background for discovering the meanings inherent, even though hidden, in the texts.

Second, the work needs to be comprehensive. First and foremost the inquirer must be prepared to seed almost all the educational points the could be found in the Islamic texts and then to systematize them in a possible comprehensive model. This does not necessarily indicate that all we need in the educational affairs today could be found explicitly in the text. Rather, such a comprehensive system might need the inquirer to use the implications of the explicit Islamic teachings and conduct scientific studies and provide enough data for such a system.

Finally, originality of the work is important. This is because, at the present, many of the written works on Islamic education are quite general and sometimes repetitious. This area of inquiry needs to flourish.

These are the important criteria which Islamic inquiries in education should take into account in their studies. This purpose is intended in this book. However, to what extent it is achieved needs to be judged by insightful critics.

I should acknowledge my colleagues Hossain Esskandari and Bahman Akbari for theirs helpful attempts in preparing this book.

Chapter One

Meaning and Coherence

Of

'Islamic Education'

Using phrases containing a combination of religion and science, such as 'Islamic Psychology' of 'Christian Psychology', has always raised a question as to the meaningfulness of such phrases. This question is rooted in a doubt about the compatibility of religion and science. Given that religious discourses have a kind of meaning in themselves, the question renders to whether there will also be a recognizable sense in their combination, or, otherwise, the combination will be nonsense. The same question has been raised about the phrase 'Islamic education'. In this case, however, the question has found a further component on the ground that 'education', other than its theoretical and scientific dimension, could refer to practice. Hence, there will be two components for the question; one referring to the meaning of 'Islamic education', in the realm of theory, and the other to its coherence, in the realm of practice. In this chapter, the two components of the question will be addressed respectively with the claim that there are grounds for defending of meaning and coherence in the phrase concerned.

Meaning of ‘Islamic education’

Questioning the meaning of ‘Islamic education’ is based on the presupposition that education be considered a branch of human empirical sciences. In this case, when using the above phrase, the intention will be ‘[the science of] Islamic Education’. It is because of such use of these words and other similar words, i.e., ‘Christian Education’, that the question as to whether such phrases essentially contain any meaning or not, comes about.

Doubt about the meaning of ‘Islamic education’

Hirst (1974) believes that phrases such as ‘Christian Education’ is nonsense. Naturally, his statement also includes ‘Islamic Education’ as he states in footnote 1 of the first chapter of his book: “As this book is concerned primarily with secularization in our society, the term ‘religion’ is used throughout with the Christian religion in mind. However, much if not all that is said about religion applies to other faiths as well.” (p. 7) Discussing about the meaninglessness of phrases such as ‘Islamic Education’ indicates that there is a sharp contrast between the two words contained in it that, even in combination, no sensible meaning is yielded.

This is as if someone talks about ‘square circle’; these two words, when combined, do not constitute any clear meaning in mind. As such, words, in turn, become meaningless; e.g., “The total angles of a circle square is 360 degrees”.

Hirst’s argument regarding meaningless phrases such as ‘Islamic Education’ rests on his view about the distinct “forms of knowledge” Hirst, 1965: 1974). According to this view, there are different forms of theoretical knowledge which “can be distinguished in terms of the logical features and truth of the propositions with which they are primarily concerned.” (1993, p. 196). Based on this view, Hirst’s argument is as follows: on the one hand, he holds that religious knowledge does not have a distinctive form, and on the other hand, scientific knowledge is autonomous of other forms of knowledge, including religion.

So far as the first point, namely the indistinctive position of religious knowledge, is concerned, while Hirst talks of ‘religious knowledge’, he is not sure that is could be considered as a separate form of knowledge. Rather, he holds, it might be something like geographical knowledge, which is a collection of knowledge from other forms (Hirst, 1965, p. 46). Given that religious knowledge does not have a distinctive feature, the question could be raised as to how could one properly call ‘education’

Islamic. In other words, what is termed as religious knowledge, will be turned, in the final analysis, to knowledges of other kinds, say, philosophical, ethical and so on.

A further notion Hirst holds in the case of the first point is that Christian [or Islamic] beliefs held in the relevant religious texts, belong to a specific social background in the past. Assuming that one can derive specific educational principles from such religious texts, how can one generalize them to a completely different social background that has emerged in our time and our industrialized societies. In other words, how can we separate a historical phenomenon (Islamic or Christian educational teachings) from its historical limitations so as to secure the generality of science (science of Education). In addition, considering differences among the interpreters of religious texts, how can we be sure that such teachings are in fact truly 'Christian' or 'Islamic'? (Hirst, 1974, pp. 78-79). Hence, Hirst suggests that interpreting 'Islamic Education' on the basis of its second element will also create difficulties in the significance of such a phrase which results from linking a generalizable issue to a restricted and historical one.

Concerning the second point, namely the autonomous character of scientific knowledge, Hirst believes that "…scientific understanding is therefore of its nature autonomous." (1974, p. 82). In other words, a

scientific field does not acquire its concepts, forms of argument and criterion for testing hypotheses, from any other sources; rather, the framework of any field or form of knowledge has its own peculiarities. For instance, philosophical knowledge deals with concepts that are specific to this type of knowledge; i.e., philosophical concepts are of second order type. Also, the argument for claims in the area of philosophy is specific to it and cannot be applied to other areas; as one might say that philosophical analysis is of rational and speculative type. Finally, the criterion of testing beliefs and hypotheses in philosophy is also specific to it, as one might take it to be rational criticism. Now, when we discuss the science of 'Education', here also we are dealing with a form of knowledge which uses specific types of concepts, arguments and criteria for testing hypotheses which best correspond to its scientific and empirical framework.

Regardless of whether 'Education' is itself a distinct scientific field or it is and applied field based on the findings of other scientific and empirical fields, it deals with specific and certain types of aforementioned points. Education, as an empirical science, inevitably deals with first-order concepts relevant to its subject; it utilizes specific methods to support its claims which deal with providing empirical evidence, and it has a specific criterion for testing hypotheses which is somewhat differently termed as

empirical verifiability (Positivists), empirical falsifiability (Popper), or progressive process of prediction and control of facts (Lakatos). In any case, what is important is that science has its own logical and methodological principles which relate to its own structure and are not borrowed from anywhere else.

Discussing 'Islamic education' might indicate that there is an educational science of Islamic type. Whereas, if there is anything that bears the label of science, it must have its own logical and methodological characteristics; otherwise, associating it with something outside of that realm is a repudiation of its independence. Thus, according to Hirst, the phrase 'Islamic Education' is meaningless because it indicates that a certain type of science is dependent to a specific system of belief. So, Hirst (1974) believes that even if someone claims that certain sciences have developed in the background of Christian [or Islamic] beliefs, this, being historically true, does not affect the nature of scientific activity: "To maintain that it was only in a context of Christian belief that science did in fact arise, even if true, does not affect that nature of the activity of science at all. The pursuit is perfectly compatible with quite other beliefs, as is obvious in the present day, and nothing by way of historical, sociological, or psychological analysis can in any way deny the claim that the concepts and

principles of science are in no sense logically connected with Christian beliefs." (p. 82). In other words, he believes that the coexistence of science and ideology, at a specific point in time, is accidental and such coexistence does not affect the logical nature of science.

The boundaries of meaningfulness in 'Islamic education'

In discussing Hirst's idea, we will allude briefly to the first point in his argument, namely the indistinctive nature of religious knowledge. Recently, David Carr (1994, 1996) has tried to show that there are distinctive religious and spiritual truths. In other words, spiritual truths cannot be put under categories of other truths, like those of natural science, mathematics, moral knowledge and so on. According to Carr, while some religious claims are expressed directly, others are of necessity indirect or metaphorical. By this he does not mean that metaphorical language is distinctive of religion; rather, it is only necessary to some religious expressions. However, he states that there are distinctive religious truths. He gives four examples of what is stated in the Bible to display the distinctive character of this type of truth: 'Man does not live by bread alone'; 'No man can serve two masters'; 'What does it profit a man to gain the whole world and lose his soul?'; and 'Sufficient unto the day is the evil

thereof'. Mackenzie (1998), in a critical review, has stated that the four examples are not distinctive truths; rather, they belong, respectively, to social-scientific (knowledge of ourselves and other minds), logical (formal knowledge), moral knowledge, and moral knowledge.

Contrary to Mackenzie, as Hodson (1973) stated, the pivotal point in (theistic) religious discourse is God. Hence, in almost all religious statements, God is presupposed one way or another. For instance, 'No man can serve two masters' indicates that human's heart cannot be a place for God's love, and, at the same time, love for one's belongings. There is a similar statement in the Qur'an: 'Allah sets forth an example: there is a man in whom are (several) partners conflicting with one another, and there is another man wholly owned by one man. Are the two alike in condition? All praise is due to Allan. Nay! Most of them do not know.' (Zumar: 29). It is stated here that love of God and love of earthly things are not compatible. Contrary to Mackenzie, the point is not a merely formal one; rather, content is important here, and what is involved in this content is relation to God. Where God is implicitly or explicitly presupposed in a statement, it is clear that it does not belong to any branch of science. Nor is it belong to philosophy. Neither the discourse of science nor that of philosophy necessarily focuses on God. While, for instance, natural

sciences deal with what is happening in the world as occurrences, theistic religions look at them as actions of God. It is clear that statements containing this type of looking at the world does not belong to natural sciences, nor are they verifiable in these sciences. Similarly, philosophy, even in its metaphysical sense, let alone new versions of philosophy, is not concerned, first and foremost, with God. It could happen that a philosopher speak about God in his philosophy, but it is not necessarily the case. It follows that religious statements are not included in other branches of know ledge; rather, their realm is distinctive of them.

It is worth noting that for a realm of knowledge to be distinctive, it is not necessary that the realm is quite separate from other realms without any kind of overlapping. This point seems to be acceptable to Mackenzie as has well argued for a non-avoidable overlapping among different branches of knowledge (Mackenzie 1985). What is required, instead, is that there should be, in addition to the shared parts, a distinctive part for an autonomous realm of knowledge. For instance, given that mathematics and morality are two distinctive realms of knowledge, it might be the case that ethical statements include criteria distinctive of mathematics, as 'four' virtues were discussed by Aristotle. However, what makes a statement ethical is, for instance, a criterion to the effect that the deeds of a person be

due to his or her will or sense of responsibility. The same point can be said in the case of religious knowledge. It might be the case that religious statements include some criteria or standards of other branches of knowledge, say, mathematics, science, and philosophy. For instance, when we discuss the Trinity, whether affirmatively or negatively, we have presupposed mathematical standards. However, our statement does not belong to mathematics; rather, there is something in the statement which makes it distinctive of religion and it is speaking about God.

What could be said about the problem of historical distance of Islamic scriptures from our time and the relevant difficulties of their interpretation? Briefly, if we consider the historicity of thoughts and beliefs as an obstacle to their generalization, we have stepped into an abyss of relativism which leaves no credibility for any ideas. Some values and teachings in religious texts might be limited to a scope beyond which they do not remain unchanged; however, such limitation is not necessarily historical. And if, in fact, there was no possibility for such generalization, how is it that in our industrialized societies, the belief in religious teachings has continued to exist? Of course, separation of generalizable and context-dependent religious teachings is related to the interpretation of scriptures. And although differences emerge among commentators, judging such

differences requires resorting to methods and procedures of interpretation, and it is not the case that preference among different interpretations is not possible.

Now, we will address the second part of Hirst's argument at some length. He believed that due to the independent nature of science, relating it to a religion would yield a nonsense combination. We will deal with this statement at two separate parts: in regard to science method and its logical framework, and in regard to the place of theory in science.

Independence of science from religion: the realm of method

It seems that Hirst's claim as to the independent nature of science is based on the methodological and logical features of science. Therefore, he believes," …what is meant by saying that science rests on Christian presuppositions, when the tests for its claims are ultimately matters of sense observation, is obscure. Scientific terms have meaning and criteria of application which are not connected with religious concepts of any sort." (1974, p. 82). His emphasis on 'sense observation' and 'criteria for application' of scientific terms indicates that the methodological and logical features of science is at the focus of his attention.

Hirst's claim is acceptable only so far as it relates to the methodological and logical features of science. If one's purpose in using the phrase 'religious science' (or particular cases of it like 'Islamic education') is that the methodology of science and its logical characteristics is obtained from religion, he undoubtedly has denied the independence of science. Science as a branch of human knowledge, does not necessarily obtain its methodology and logical features from religious presuppositions. It is quite possible that empirical methodology and logical features of science be based on non-religious and atheistic presuppositions. Therefore, religious presuppositions cannot be deemed necessary and essential for science. In this case, the phrase 'religious science' would be meaningless because science, being independent from religion, is called religious.

Based on this, the efforts of people like Michael Foster to consider the worldview of Judo-Christianity as a necessary condition for the emergence of the new science (see Peterson et al., 1991, ch. 11) is in vain. He believes that the Greek's worldview, with Plato's and Aristotle's undeniable impact on it, was ad essentialist as well as a formalist viewpoint. Based on this viewpoint, the world not only has a rational order, but also, this order is necessarily issued and determined by God or The First Cause and could not be otherwise. The type of science that could be developed on the basis of

this type of worldview, would be a science with the methodology of rational argumentation for defining and recognizing the nature of entities, and surely not a science with the methodology of observation and experience, and it was indeed exemplified by Aristotelian science. Foster believes that the Judo-Christian viewpoint introduced God as autonomous. Accordingly, the world is not issued by God in a necessary and determined way, rather, with regard to God's will, the world could be in change instead of being predetermined in a restricted way. According to Foster, this was the only philosophy of nature that could form the foundation of the new science and its empirical methodology. Observation and experience become important only in a world which lacks a rational and predetermined framework, and in which God, at His own discretion, can alter its features.

Foster has alluded in his statement to an important point. Namely that major religions have suggested new teachings in regard to the world of being. Nevertheless, the main direction of his argument is false. Even in a predetermined world, we can find a place for observation and empirical methodology. The role of observation and experience in such a world is that one by considering and object for a number of times, can distinguish its basic and stable features from precarious ones (doing of which requires

observation, comparison and experience) and then, by taking a philosophical step, to discuss its natural and accidental characteristics.

What has been said so far can be summarized in that religious presupposition, cannot be considered as an essential or necessary condition for the methodology of science which is an indication of the independence of science methodology from religious presuppositions. However, it must be remembered that such an independence for the methodology of science does not mean that the method of science can be independent of any kind of presupposition. On the contrary, the methodology of science never develops on a background devoid of any type of presuppositions. Explaining the 'possibility' of using a scientific method and justifying its 'credibility', of suing a scientific method and justifying its 'credibility', requires the reliance on some kind of presupposition about the world and human being: possibility and credibility of a scientific method cannot be determined on its own basis because this requires a vicious circle; thus one must resort to conditions outside of that, and these are the aforementioned presuppositions.

Although religious presuppositions do not play the role of necessary conditions and are not, solely, the sufficient conditions required for scientific method, yet, they can constitute some part of the sufficient

conditions for that. What does it mean to constitute some part of the sufficient conditions? It means that, at least, in one situation, there could be an empirical knowledge which, in respect to method, is based on presuppositions some of which are religious presuppositions. What foster stated regarding the changing of the worldview by the holy religions, is an example of a religious presupposition which constitutes a part of sufficient conditions for resorting to empirical method. Now, it must be kept in mind that there exists a conceptual link between presuppositions of science and the body of science itself (and in our discussion its method). For instance, in our example, there is a conceptual link between the religious presupposition that God is acting autonomously in this world and the need for observational method and pursuing changes constantly. Thus, if someone employs such a presupposition, due to the conceptual link between this presupposition and research methods based on it, he has bestowed a religious content to his science methodology. So, Hirst's firm statement as to "scientific terms have meaning and criteria of application which are not connected with religious concepts of any sort" is too hard to be acceptable.

It can be concluded from the discussion up to this point that, with respect to science methodology, 'religious science' is meaningless if one means

that religious presuppositions are necessary conditions for science. However, it is a sensible phrase if one means by that that religious presuppositions provide a part of the set of sufficient conditions for science methodology.

Independence of science from religion: The realm of theory

The second part of this discussion on Hirst's belief concerning the meaninglessness of the phrase 'religious science', relates to the status of theory in science. As it was noted in the previous section, it seems that Hirst, in explaining that science has an independent nature, deliberately refers to science methodology and overlooks the realm of theory. Incidentally, in this realm the independence of science cannot be claimed; rather, the influence of presuppositions are very salient in it.

Following the demise of verifiability viewpoint in science during the second half of the twentieth century, the importance of theory has become increasingly salient. According to this, even observations of a scientist are not direct and pure; rather, they are under strict influence of his beliefs and theoretical background. Therefore, philosophers of science emphasize that a theory-free observation is not possible (Hanson, 1967 and Lakatos, 1970, among others). Here, the world 'theory' entails suppositions and estimations of scientists as well as their intellectual background. According to this, the presuppositions of scientists play important roles in shaping their theories.

Hirst emphasizes that the method and logical framework of science is independent and science does not borrow it from anywhere else. Despite

the qualifications needed to be done on this statement which were considered in the previous section, if we assume that it is true, there still remains a question as to what contents would a logical framework of science entail and what kind of theoretical contents is endorsed by empirical method of science. In the realm of science, based on its logical structure, a specific type of concepts (called 'first-order' concepts) are employed. However, the important point is that what kinds of contents would constitute such concepts. Behavioristic psychology is concerned with concepts of stimulus, with respect to their framework, are considered first-order; however, the question is that what kind of theoretical contents do they have. According to such contents, human behavior is formed by environmental stimuli and that is based on more profound presuppositions regarding human nature. On this basis, human behavior, like every other natural phenomenon, is affected by forces outside of itself and changes according to the formation of such forces. Such content affected by the scientist's presuppositions, is not a part of an independent nature of science anymore; rather, it is a part of its dependent nature. The content scientists provide for the logical structure of concepts is due to their intellectual, philosophical and cultural background and this indicates that science in its theoretical content is cultural and, in its particular cases, religious.

If a psychologist performs research based on presuppositions derived from Islamic beliefs, it would provide a different theoretical content for the logical structure of concepts of the science of psychology. Based on these presuppositions, the human being is not affected by environmental forces in the same way that other natural phenomena are; rather, the basic form of his behavior must be considered as his ‘action’ which is based on belief, desire and will. Accordingly, humans are responsible for their actions and as a result they can be rewarded or punished. If psychological researches are performed based on such Islamic presuppositions about human nature, the results would be different from current psychological views and such difference comes from theoretical content rising from different presuppositions.

Now, if these two different types of presuppositions and their corresponding psychological systems enter the realm of education, it would lead to the formation of two different types of educational science and two different subsequent educational systems. Our perception of education, according to the two different viewpoints is different. Presupposition of Behaviorists on human nature brings about this type of conception for education: Education means the regulation of an individual’s surrounding forces such that it could lead to the formation of a specific behavior in him.

Islamic beliefs about human being lead to another conception of education: Education means the regulation of an individual's surrounding such that he would have the opportunity to be able to recognize the right and wrong ideas, to choose the right ideas and act accordingly. In addition to the conception and meaning of education, principles and methods of education in the two viewpoints will, also, be different. Such differences will naturally come about from both, the theoretical concepts rising from the relevant presuppositions and research findings in science formed on the basis of theoretical background of such presuppositions.

Thus, in the theoretical aspect of science, one can meaningfully talk about 'religious science' including cases such as Islamic psychology or Islamic education. The logical structure of science and its empirical method does not create and obstacle for the meaningfulness of such phrases. In relation to the empirical method of science, with respect to its theoretical dimension, it must be noted that empirical evidence are put forward for or against hypotheses rising from presuppositions. In case the evidence is against the hypotheses, such hypotheses are usually set aside and new ones will be formed based on those presuppositions until supporting evidence are found. In other words, empirical evidence act as a balance that can distinguish hollow hypotheses from complete ones. However, empirical

evidence does not eliminate the dependence of hypotheses to their presupposition. Therefore, if experience supported a hypothesis, it supports it along with the very influences that it has taken from presuppositions.

In addition, presuppositions are not immediately at the exposure of falsifying empirical evidence. Empirical evidence either support of falsifying empirical evidence. Empirical evidence either support hypotheses or refute them but they do not either support or refute presuppositions. As Lakatos (1970) states, as long as the 'hard core', or the presupposition, of a theory can produce powerful hypotheses in a productive manner, science will progress, and when powerful hypotheses in explaining, predicting and controlling facts no longer emerge from the hard core, then the research program will decline. Experience and empirical evidence do not confirm or falsify presuppositions; rather, they persuade us to either abandon or keep them.

In summary, the phrase 'Islamic Education' cannot be considered as a meaningless phrase, rather, there are boundaries to its meanings that must be carefully delineated. If 'Islamic Education', as an example of religious science, is perceived in such a way that, in it, religious presuppositions are the necessary condition for the activity of science, then it would be a meaningless phrase. But in two cases, that phrase is meaningful. First, in

the area of science methodology, religious presuppositions must be considered as a part of the set of sufficient conditions for its emergence. Second, in the theoretical area of science, religious presuppositions must be considered as a possible source for producing and developing scientific hypotheses. In both cases, particularly in the second one, science can take a religious shape according to which one can discusses 'religious science' in general and 'Islamic Education' in particular.

Coherence in 'Islamic education'

The discussion about coherence or incoherence in the phrase 'Islamic Education' is considered within the realm of practice. In other words, in this phrase, if what is meant by the word 'education' is the practice of education, and not the science of education, then upon claiming that such a phrase is incoherent, it would mean that '[the practice] of Islamic education' is paradoxical.

Doubt about the coherence of 'Islamic education'

Continuing his discussion about the meaninglessness of phrases such as '[the science of] Islamic Education', Hirst points out that if someone considers the concept of 'religious education' as a more limited concept

than an educational science; i.e. as the collection of educational efforts which take place in religious settings, then he or she may conclude that, so far, discussing ‘religious education’ can be meaningful. However, Hirst believes that ‘religious education’ cannot be claimed even within this limited boundary because, in the realm of practice, such a phrase would have a paradoxical nature. In other words, if a previous generation was involved in the transmission of social legacy, such an attempt, in itself, cannot be regarded as education. Such transmission can occur in various manners of which only one can merit the title of ‘education’.

Hirst’s doubt is based on the distinction that educational philosophers make between ‘indoctrination’ and ‘education’. According to this distinction, what is transpiring, with regard to the transmission of beliefs to the new generation, in religious settings is indoctrination and not education. According to Hirst and Peters (1970), in order to use the concept of 'education' properly, two conditions must be met: desirability and knowledge development (p. 20). On this account, education means the individuals into a form of life which is worthwhile, and knowledge and understanding play a fundamental role in it.

Of course, knowledge and understanding here refer to the public form of experience and not personal beliefs and understanding taken to be certain

merely by the individual who believe them. In the public form of knowledge, there are common concepts as well as objective tests for claims. Hirst (1974) believes that, of the two conditions, at least, the second condition does not apply to religious claims: "In religion, I have argued, this means that no particular substantive claims can be either assumed to be, or simply taught as, objectively acceptable." (p. 86). Based on this statement, since no necessary condition for the correct use of the concept of education is true of religious claims, hence the phrase of 'religious education' will be contradictory.

According to Hirst, there is only one type of usage in which the phrase 'religious education' can be coherent and that is when an objective conception of religion is a society is an objective reality and empirical claims can be stated about that which can be publicly examined. In order to grasp an in depth understanding of religious ceremonies, if necessary, the individual can put himself or herself, in an imaginative state. He can imaging himself the follower of a particular religion ad participate in the ceremonies; this would also count as a part of an objective understanding and can be a part of a religious education. However, Hirst holds, if the goal of a program is to shape and form religions dispositions and specific emotions towards God in an individual which could be justified, merely, by

accepting that relation, then this cannot be considered as a part of education. Instead, it would be a personal matter. Consequently, if the transmission of religious beliefs and customs are included in an educational program such that it would be outside the realm of objective knowledge, then the rubric of 'indoctrination', not 'education', would apply to it. On this interpretation, the use of the phrase 'religious education' is contradictory because an indoctrinatory matter is one that cannot be publicly defended in an objective manner. Education and rationality coexist. Every matter that is rationally defensible can be considered as a part of education even though it is a personal matter (p. 88).

The criterion of indoctrination

In discussing Hirst's view, first, we must determine as to what the criterion for indoctrination is and which cases it can be applied to. Some believe that the criterion for indoctrination must be determined according to the subject that is being conveyed to others. Peter (1966) addresses this point with regard to the origin of the word 'indoctrination' that is 'doctrine' (creed, a collection of beliefs). In other words, a creed or doctrine creates a fertile ground for indoctrination. This indicates that if we are dealing with knowledge, indoctrination is not involved because knowledge consists of reasonable beliefs. Religion and politics have been viewed as matters which, due to their being doctrines, are regarded as an appropriate realm for indoctrination.

However, subject is not a precise criterion for the recognition of indoctrination because even in the realm of science and knowledge, i.e., reasonable beliefs, it is possible to create room for indoctrination. In other words, if we decide to rely on the above-mentioned word-origin for the recognition of indoctrination cases, it must be noted that it is not too difficult to create a 'doctrine' from science and then indoctrinate it. Feyerabend (1981) states that Seventeenth and Eighteenth century's science was, indeed, a tool for liberty and enlightenment, but it cannot be deduced

that science will surely remain such a tool. He holds that neither in science nor in any other ideology can be found a natural element that would make it inherently liberating. Ideologies can be obliterated and be turned into religions. He says that his criticism of modern science is that it prohibits the freedom of thought (pp. 119-121). Not only is it the case that science can be transformed into a doctrine, but it is also the case that a religious ideology can agitate the process of scientific indoctrination. Taking this aspect into consideration, Feyerabend states that greetings to Californian Christian fundamentalists who have been able to eliminate the rigid formulation of the evolution theory from school books and replace it with the Bible's account of genesis (p. 129). As a result, an appropriate criterion for the recognition of indoctrination cases cannot be obtained according to subject and realm.

Others have sought the criterion of indoctrination 'method' rather than in subject. If a claim is such that it cannot be tested by an objective method, then its transmission to others would be indoctrination. Hirst's viewpoint is consistent with this line of thinking. So is the view of those who have tried to present verifiability or falsifiability as objective methods of testing and as the criterion for distinguishing indoctrination cases.

Although, in this case, method is important, we must not exaggerate its importance. Neither objective testing is easily attainable nor can we easily decide about the indoctrination of something if we did nor can we e reach to objective testing. Regarding the first create difficulties in understanding the implications of evidence. Different theories subject the same evidence to different interpretations and, based on this, pure facts are barely accessible which. In turn, makes the task of objective testing scientific theories has long been sustained and despite the fact that scientists yearn for objectivity, this feature disallows the straightening out of various theories. Despite Hirst's view which states that religious claims are not testable in an objective manner and have "radically controversial character" (1974, p. 86), scientific claims also have controversial features and to achieve objectivity in them is not quite easy. Anyway, being controversial does not change anything into an indoctrination matter.

The second point is that the dispossession of an objective test dose not necessarily drive everything into the realm of indoctrination. Basically, human's intellect is incapable of examining everything objectively and of, ultimately, drawing a definite boundary between objective and un-objective matters. Even in the realm of science, there are assumptions that cannot be subjected to objective testing and we can only accept them and conduct

scientific work based on them. As the critics of positivism have righty claimed, the principle of empirical verifiability, itself, is not empirically verifiable despite being the basis of verifiability (Passmore 1968, ch. 11). As a result, one cannot claim that believing in whatever that is not objectively testable is indoctrination and irrational. Reason must learn modesty and realize that it is restricted by some boundaries and it is not the case that if something lays beyond those boundaries, it does not exist or that believing in it is absurd. It is worth noting that the acceptance of intellectual boundaries, itself, is rational. Accepting such boundaries will result in two types of knowledge for human reason: affirmative knowledge regarding what is within those boundaries and negative knowledge regarding what is beyond those boundaries. Given that something lays beyond the boundaries of reason, regarding what is within its boundaries, reason can determine what that thing 'is', and this is a type of knowledge.

Having discussed on subject and method as unacceptable criteria for indoctrination, we will explain the acceptable criterion as "style of presentation" or, as Smart (1973) put it, "attitude" in presenting subjects. The difference between this criterion and the previous one (i.e., method) is that method is merely concerned with logical structure of statements. When we say a subject is verifiable of falsifiable, what we actually mean by that

the logical structure of the subject is such that is would render it falsifiable or un-falsifiable. Smart is very much doubtful as to the possibility of considering verifiability or falsifiability as a dividing point between scientific themes, at the one hand, and doctrines, at the other, because the influence of metaphysical element in science and scientific themes prevents such themes from becoming empirically (verifiable or) falsifiable (p. 42); and thus, become similar to doctrines. Smart believes that the kind of attitude towards opposing evidence is what can separate indoctrination subject from other un-falsifiable matters. If here is this attitude towards a subject that no opposing evidence can falsify it, then this subject within the realm of such attitude will turn into an indoctrination matter. 'Attitude' draws our attention to something more than the logical structure of a subject, and that is our style of encountering with opposing evidence regarding the subject. As Smart puts it: a scientific matter within its logical structure, because of the influence of metaphysical elements in it, is not empirically falsifiable; however, the scientists' attitude towards it is such that it would always leave the possibility for its falsehood and heeds to opposing evidence.

If the style of presenting matters or the attitude towards opposing evidence is considered as a criterion for indoctrination, then any theme

with any method will have the potentiality to become an indoctrination matter, given and science, depending on the type of attitude adopted to present or to expand them, may or may not change into indoctrination matters. If a religious scholar present its religious knowledge with the attitude of leaving no room for any opposing views, then its role cannot be called 'education', rather it is indoctrination. Similarly, if a scientist presents or expands his scientific knowledge with an attitude of preparing a weapon, in advanced, for deterring any possible opposing evidence, he or she has, in fact, engaged in indoctrination instead of working in the field of 'education' or 'science'.

Boundaries of coherence in 'Islamic education'

Considering what was explained above, now if we return to our main discussion about coherence, it must be stated that the phrase 'religious education' does not necessarily have a contradictory and incoherent nature. This is because the element of religion or religiousness in it, does not necessarily have an indoctrinatory nature that would make it incompatible with education, which has a rational nature. It is worth noting, here, that it is not the case that even the phrase 'scientific education', necessarily, has a coherent nature; rather, if scientific of indifference towards opposing

evidence, that phrase will, also, be contradictory. Incidentally, in our times, science in universities has, more or less, encountered such a situation. Referring to the role science plays in education nowadays, Feyerabend (1981) says that in universities, brainwashing is taking place in an orderly manner. By saying this, he does not of course mean that there is no criticism, whatsoever, in universities; rather, the point is that such criticisms do not apply to the position of science itself (p. 120). In other words, an immunizational attitude has been adopted towards science itself, and this is what bestows an indoctrinatory nature to a theme.

Accordingly, absolutism must be abandoned and this question must be put forward that in which cases, 'Islamic Education' would be coherent and under which circumstances it would assume a contradictory nature. Of course, this question, itself, is based on a presupposition that the concept of 'education' (in the realm of practice) has a certain and independent meaning so that it can be said that it is compatible with a view and incompatible with another view. In Hirst's discussion, this presupposition has been completely held and he, according to his analytical position, believes that concepts have specific meanings. However, this presupposition, in its strong sense, it unacceptable because the concept of education, itself, it defined, to a large extent, according to viewpoint and there is not a single

and agreed upon meaning for it. Yet, it is possible to defend this presupposition in its weak sense to the effect that education must lead to growth and development in the human being and although such equivalent terms (growth and development) are also defined based on viewpoints, some agreeable criteria can be found for them. For instance, it can be stated that education must create an independence (in action and/ or viewpoint) in the individual. If an individual is quite dependent on others so that he or she could not act and/ or think by himself or herself, then it can be concluded that he has remained in his childhood and has not been educated. Such criteria can provide a relatively agreed upon meaning for education and, to that extent, the above-mentioned presupposition is acceptable in its weak sense.

Hence, when we pose the question, 'Is Islamic Education a coherent phrase?', the intention is that if human's thoughts and acts are adjusted according to Islam's viewpoint, will this result in his growth and development? If the answer was in positive, then that phrase would be coherent; however, if the answer was in negative, then the resulting changes in the individual would not be an indication of education; rather, they might be an indication of indoctrination, and, as such, the above phrase will be incoherent.

In chapter three, a conception of education is suggested with reliance on the contents of Islamic texts. Accordingly, Islamic Education refers to the process of becoming divine. This process requires that one knows God (Allah) as the Lord of the world and the human, chooses Him as his or her Lord, and undertakes His Lordship (al-rububiyyah) and avoids taking others as his Lord. Based on this definition, the purpose of education is that human beings become divine. Becoming divine contains three elements: knowledge (of God as the Lord), choice (choosing God as one’s Lord), and action (undertaking God’s Lordship throughout one’s life). These three elements involve rationality.

Firstly, knowing God, as He has introduced Himself in the Qur’an, involves rationality. In other words, in order to know God as, to say the least, the unique Lord of the world (Ikhlas; 1), or that there will be a day (The Other Day) in which God will be the Lord and will evaluate humans’ actions throughout their lives (Fathah: 3), one needs to understand the reasons God has given for each of the cases in the Qur’an and, thereby, to be persuaded internally without external coercion or indoctrination. The Qur’an has persisted that a rational belief (including belief in God) could not be based on blind imitation of outstanding personalities or blind acceptance of given traditions (Zukhruf: 43). Hence, taking knowledge of

the Qur’an about God not only naturally involves rationally. It also requires that one read it and think about what is stated in a rational manner. Rationality, here, is held in its wide sense, As it was explained before, one not only can positively be rational about what is within the realm of the reason. It is also possible that one be negatively rational about what is outside the explicit boundaries of the reason.

The second element, namely choosing God as one’s Lord, also involves rationality. Given that one has acquired rational knowledge about God to the effect that He is the Lord, it is naturally quite rational to choose Him as one’s Lord. Hume’s well-known proclaimed logical gap between ‘is’ and ‘ought’ might be reclaimed here. According to him, one cannot logically deduce an ‘ought’ from premises containing ‘is’. However, this claim need not to be touched here directly. Given that this claim is valid, we are concerned here only about what is rational. In other words, there is a recognizable difference between something being logically valid and rationally valid. Again, rationality here refers to a wide sense of the word. Every logically valid point is rationally valid too, but not vice versa. While it might not be logically valid to follow an ‘ought’, given an ‘is’, it is usually considered rational or reasonable to do so. Hence, it is quite

reasonable for someone who rationally knows that only God is deserved to be the Lord, to choose Him as one's Lord.

Likewise, given that the first two elements are rational, the third one, namely undertaking God's sayings and acting accordingly, will also be rational. This is the case, particularly because undertaking God as one's Lord indicates that one is at a long process of gradual and continuous departure from the dominance of social, environmental and instinctual factors. It is not possible to undertake God's sayings as those of The Lord and, yet, be under the dominance of internal and instinctual desires or social and environmental requirements.

Therefore, this conception of Islamic education, by its three basic elements, involves rationality. such a conception of education is, also, consistent with the relatively agreed upon meaning or indicators of education, i.e., with indices such as independence in action and/ or thought, solid personality and so on. It follows that the phrase 'Islamic Education', according to what was discussed, is coherent. So far as the 'Islamic' component of this phrase is concerned, a concept of education was introduced, based on religious texts, which was compatible with the component of 'education' which is concerned with the relatively agreed upon meaning of education.

References

Carr, D. (1994). Knowledge and truth in religious education. Journal of Philosophy of Education, 28, 221-238.

Carr, D. (1996). Rival conceptions of spiritual education. Journal of Philosophy of Education, 30, 159-179.

Feyerabend, P. (1981). How to defend society against science. In I. Hacking (ed.) Scientific Revolutions, Oxford University Press, 156-167.

Hanson, N.R. (1967). Observation and interpretation. In S. Morgenbesser (ed.), Philosophy of Science Today. New York: Basic Books.

Hirst, P. H. (1965). Liberal education and the nature of knowledge. Reper. in his Knowledge and the Curriculum. London: Routledge & Eegan Paul, 1974, 30-53.

Hirst, P. H. (1974). Moral Education in a Secular Society. University of London Press Ltd.

Hirst, P. H. (1993). Education, knowledge and practices. In Robin Barrow and Patricia White (eds.), Beyond Liberal Education, London: Routledge, 184-199.

Hodson, J. (1973). Is religious education possible? In G. Langford and D. J. O'Connor (eds.), New Essays in the Philosophy of Education. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

Lakatos, I. (1970). Falsification and the methodology of scientific research programmes. In I. Lakatos and A. Musgrave (eds.), Criticism and the Growth of Knowledge. Cambridge University Press.

Mackenzie, J. (1985). Evers & Walker and forms of knowledge. Journal of Philosophy of Education, 19,2.

Mackenzie, J. (1998). David Carr on religious knowledge and spiritual education. Journal of Philosophy of Education, 32, 3, 409-427.

Passmore, J. (1968). A Hundred Years of Philosophy. Penguin Books.

Peters, R. S. (1966). Ethics and Education. London: Routledge.

Peterson, M.; Hasker, W.; Reichenbach, B.; And Bazinger, D. (1991). Reason and Religious Belief: An Introduction on the Philosophy of Religion. Oxford University Press.

Smart, P. (1973). The concept of indoctrination. In G. Langford and D.J. O'Connor (eds.), New Essays in the Philosophy of Education. London: Routledge.

Chapter Two

The Description of Man in the Qur'an

Changing the human is not possible unless we have a picture and description of him or her. Thus, in every educational system, description of the human is its touchstone; this is because all parts of an educational system, including its conceptions, analogies, aims, principles, methods, and educational stages relate to the description of the human in one way or another. To which end should the human be led out, how is his or her move toward that end and what is it like, with what rules and methods should he or she be changed, from which stages should her or she pass to be able to reach the aims; all of these are related to the human condition as it is seen by an educational system. This sequence will be followed in this book. First, a description of the human will be suggested according to the Qur'an, and subsequently the concept of education, educational analogies, aims, foundations, principles, methods, and stages will be discussed accordingly.

In order to gain a description of the human in the Qur'an, first, the basic concepts used in the Qur'an in talking about the human will be discussed in an analytic view. Then, all of these concepts will be considered in a synthetic view and by explaining their interrelations, a full picture of the human will be suggested, a further point about the description of human

remains, which is the common characteristics functioning within the system of the human being. This point will be discussed later on in Chapter 4 as the foundations of education.

An analytic view

In talking about the human, the Qur'an uses certain words and concepts. In order to provide the Qur'an's description of mankind, it is necessary to analyze each of them separately. The basic words and concepts (to which some other concepts relate) used by the Qur'an in this regard are as follow: spirit (ruh), soul (nafs), divine nature (fitrah), wisdom (aql), will and choice, collective identity, and limitations of humankind. In what follows, these concepts will be analyzed, and in the case of each, related concepts will be explained.

Spirit

The concept of spirit (ruh) is used in the Qur'an, in the first place, as a cosmological concept rather than a concept limited to the humankind. The spirit is the name of a creature of God; a being similar to the angles.[1] The spirit is the origin of life in the world.[2] Thus, it could be said that the appearance of life at every level, including plant, animal, and human life, is

due to the spirit. Then what is exactly the nature of the spirit and how does it provide life is not dealt with in the Qur'an, rather it is stated that it belongs to a dark area of human knowledge.[3] It is declared, however, that whenever the constitutive materials of a being reach a certain level of complexity and processing[4], the spirit appears within it at the corresponding level, and depending upon the intensity of the appearance, certain life characteristics could be seen in the being; namely, plant, animal or human characteristics.

The level of spirit manifestation depends upon the complexity and processing level of the constitutive materials of the being. Where the word 'ruh' (spirit) is used with certain qualifications[5], it denotes these levels, and where it is used without qualifications as 'al-ruh' (The spirit)[6], it refers to the very being who originates these levels of appearance.

As for humankind, the concept of 'ruh' (spirit) is used at two levels in the Qur'an. Firstly, it is used at the level of human life when the human organism has become complicated and evolved to a sufficient level. This appearance of the spirit is common among humans. Secondly, it is used at a higher level of life which is called 'hayat-an-Taiyyibah' (Good life) in the Qur'an and its appearance depends on the deep faith in God and doing the right things.[7] Life characteristics at this level is also different from those of

lower levels. In 'pure life', the heart is turned away from polytheism, the imagination away from temptation, and the bodily organs away from filthy things. This level of life is designated to certain groups and, because of its high spiritual level, the phrase used in the Qur'an is that the human is 'strengthened' by a spirit from God.[8]

Soul

The word 'nafs' (soul) in Arabic means 'self' and in this meaning it does not refer to a particular thing. So, it needs a pronoun, and when it is used with a pronoun, its meaning becomes clear in reference to that pronoun. Is some verses of the Qur'an, 'nafs' is used in this sense and there is no other meaning for it as it is seen in this verse: "…your Lord has ordained mercy on Himself…"[9]

'Nafs', however, has gradually found a particular usage and, in addition to the above-mentioned usage, it refers to the human as a person having spirit and body. In this usage, 'nafs' in itself and without any pronoun refers to a person. In some verses of the Qur'an, this usage is seen, as it is clear in this case: "…whoever slays a soul, unless it be for manslaughter, he slew mischief in the land, it is as though he slew all men…"[10]

Finally, 'nafs' (soul) indicates a further meaning, that is the real being of the human. In this sense, even if a body disappears, its 'nafs' remains. It is in this sense that the human is addressed at the moment of dying: "…and the angels shall spread forth their hands: Give up your soul…"[11]. in other words, the soul is something that exists without its body. In this book, soul is used in the sense.

The soul has different states and in relation to every state, it is entitled to a particular name. One state of the soul appears in parallel to the appearance of an inclination in it to a joyful thing. This inclination is called 'hawa' in the Qur'an which is neutral in itself; neither positive nor negative.[12] When this inclination of the soul becomes intensive so that it must be achieved at any cost and by breaching any law, the soul is called in this states 'ammarah' (commanding the evil)[13]. Having achieved its intention, the soul loses this strong inclination. A second state of the soul appears here. In this case, the soul in fact finds itself (conscience) and becomes aware of the results of breaking laws. Thus, the soul reproaches itself. In this state, the soul is entitled to an additional name, that is 'lawwamah' (self-accusing)[14]. Finally, a third state of the soul appears when the human being becomes close to God. Closeness to God leads to a

deep calmness. With the appearance of this calmness the soul is entitled to another name, the is 'mutmainnah' (the soul at rest)[15].

All of these three states of the soul are temporal and the human's soul performs these roles one at a time. However, when one of them is performed repeatedly, it becomes steadily a trait of the soul. A soul that continuously follows its bad inclinations[16] acquires a trait that orders it to continuously do the wrong things. On the other hand, a soul that continuously watches its bad inclinations and charges them continuously, acquires a trait in terms of which self-blame originates in it[17]. And finally, a soul that continuously remembers God, acquires 'certainty' in itself as a trait[18].

Divine nature (fitrah)

The word 'fitrah' is used in the Qur'an once.[19] This word refers to an innate characteristic of the human created by God. In creating humans, God "made them witness against their own souls"[20]. Being deeply present in themselves, the humans clearly found that they have nothing of their own and even their 'selves' are deeply dependent on God[21]. In other words, they found that God intervened between them and their hearts[22]. Then, God asked the human: "Am I not your Lord?" And they who had clearly found

this replied: “Yes!”[23]. And in this way, a promise originated in the heart of the human which could not be eradicated by anyone till the meeting of man and God on the Day of resurrection.[24]

This knowledge and insight of the Lord let to an inclination towards Him; the inclination that invites the human to God whenever it becomes activated. This inclination towards truth and God is called ‘hanyfiyyah’[25]. This word refers to the human’s divine nature where the nature is alive and active.

On the whole, ‘fitrah’ and the related conceptions (like promise, and inclination towards God) indicate a certain knowledge and inclination which is originated in the human: knowledge of the Lord and inclination towards Him. On this account, the human is not colourless and neural; rather the state of his being is due to the Lord’s light.

Because of the deep penetration of this knowledge and inclination in the human’s being, the human can oversee God only when he oversees himself, and, conversely, can have a sense of God’s presence only when he could be directly present in himself; similar to the presence that God provided for man during for man during the creation. If God intervenes between the human and his heart, then escaping God and oneself occur at once; as well as settlement alongside God and in oneself.

Wisdom

The concept of wisdom or reason has a particular meaning in the Qur'an, different from some current meanings of the word. Concepts such as 'faculty of thinking', 'intelligence', and 'faculty of universal perceptions' and the like which are sometimes considered as equivalents to wisdom do not correspond with the meaning held for this word in the Qur'an.

In the Arabic, the word 'aql' (reason or wisdom) and its derivatives have the meaning of 'prevention'. 'for instance, means that someone prevented his tongue from talking. Also, 'ma' qil' means a castle which prevents enemies from entering and attacking. This meaning is seen in other derivatives of the word.

For a better understanding of the word 'aql', we could consider its opposite, namely 'jahl' (ignorance). The main meaning of this word it 'action without reflection'. In other words, as 'aql' indicates a useful prevention and control, the word 'jahl' refers to an action without contemplation that leads to harmful consequences.

In contemporary Arabic, the contrast of wisdom (aql) and ignorance (jahl) is perhaps less familiar for us than the contrast of knowledge (elm) and ignorance. However, as Muzaffar says, in the Arabic, the main contrast

had been between wisdom (aqle) and ignorance (jahl), and the contrast of knowledge (ilm) and ignorance was due to the conceptual developments after the age of the Prophet[26].

What muzaffar says is tenable because if we take ignorance (jahl) to be contrasted to knowledge (ilm), we will encounter difficulties in understanding the verses in which these words are used. Whereas, if we consider the contrast between wisdom (aql) and ignorance (jahl), we will find a clear meaning for them. Muzaffar has mentioned the verse 6 of Hujurat as an evidence for his claim. We will give another example here. Consider this verse: "…if any one of you does evil in ignorance, then turns after that and acts aright, then He is Forgiving, Merciful."[27] If we take 'ignorance' here to mean the lack of knowledge, we will encounter the difficulty of why forgiveness and mercy of God is mentioned in this verse, when an action done due to lack of knowledge could not be taken to be a sin to require forgiveness. However, if we take 'ignorance' to mean an action without reflection which is done, say, hastily, then the necessity of repentance after that and acting aright, as well as the requirement of forgiveness will be clear.

It is worth mentioning that the Qur'an uses straightforwardly the negation of knowing, rather than 'ignorance', as a contrast to knowing and

knowledge. So, we read: "…Say: Are those who know and those who do not know alike?..."[28] It is clear that if we replace 'do not know' with 'ignore' (yajhalum), given the particular meaning of the latter in the Qur'an the meaning of the verse will be changed altogether.

So far, it has been clear that, in the Arabic, the word 'aqle' (wisdom), as well as its contrast 'jahl' (ignorance), indicate that the main element in its meaning is 'prevention'; a prevention needed for providing soberness. Now, we mus consider the meaning of 'aqle' (wisdom) in the usage of the Qur'an. In fact, the same meaning is intended in Qur'an and this is clearly seen in the synonyms used in it for 'eql'. Two words are used as synonyms, namely 'hijr' and 'nuhyah', both of which indicate' prevention'. 'Hijr' means to revet with stones; so, the people of Samud who made houses in the mountains are called 'dwellers of the Rock' (ashab-al-hijr) in the Qur'an[29]. Reveting is done for determining a border between things or to immune things or persons from attacks, and wisdom (aqle) is called 'hijr' because it has such a function[30]. The other synonym, namely 'nuhyah', has also the same meaning because its origin is 'nahy' which means prevention. On this account, wisdom is called 'nuhyah'[31].

While derivatives and synonyms of 'aql' (sisdom) are used in the Qur'an according to the meaning of the word in the Arabic, it has become a

particular concept by means of the certain content given to it in the Qur'an. This content could be considered at two levels of cognition and action which are discussed below respectively.

What is the meaning of using wisdom (aql) at the level of cognition? Whenever a person is in control of his or her cognitive attempts so that he or she becomes immune to slips of thought, and, as a consequence, reaches the understanding of the thing concerned, it could be said that he or she has used wisdom at the level of cognition. Three factors play the main role in abstaining from these slips: evaluating the soundness of reasons, having knowledge, and controlling love and hate. As far as the first factor is concerned, using wisdom occurs when the person evaluates the adequacy and soundness of the reasons held. An example of this is given in the Qur'an addressing the Jews and the Christians who had claimed that their religions of the Prophet Abraham, God says: "O followers of the Book! Why do you dispute about Abraham, when the Torah and the Injeel were not revealed till after him; do you not then understand [use your wisdom]?"[32]

In relation to the second factor of using wisdom, namely having knowledge, whoever has mor knowledge is capable of using wisdom better at the level of cognition. In other words, having comprehensive knowledge

and information makes it possible for the person to have access to more materials for comparison and combining and, hence, to reach deeper cognition or more subtle recognition. Comprehensive information prevents the person from naive inferences. Thus, using wisdom requires that the person be knowledgeable. With regard to this, it is said in the Qur'an: "And (as for) these examples, we set them forth for people, and none understand them but the learned."[33] The relationship between knowledge and wisdom is, however, so complicated that it could not be limited solely to one component. We will return to this point at the end of this section.

Finally, in regard to the third factor, using wisdom at the level of cognition requires that the deviating interventions of love and hate are prevented. As love might prevent us from recognition of weaknesses, hate are fastened by the band of wisdom, the person could be immune of deviation in cognition and recognition. Thus, the Qur'an invites the people who consider the awareness of the past traditions as the criterion of their acceptability, to use wisdom.[34]

Having discussed using wisdom at the level of cognition, now it should be considered at the level of action. An act of wisdom is one which is under the control of prevention due to reflection. Using wisdom at the level of action requires a relationship between cognition and action because

reflection on action is possible by means of the acquired knowledge. In other words, using knowledge at the level of action is to move to the light of knowledge. On this account, the first person who leaves the area of wisdom at the level of action is one who does not use one's knowledge to lead one's action. Thus, according to the Qur'an, the people who invite others to do the right things without leading their own actions by means of the knowledge they hold are far from using wisdom.[35] Here we come back to the aforementioned relationship between knowledge and wisdom. Using wisdom at the level of action indicates that the action is guided by knowledge. In a tradition of Ali-ibn-Abi-Tälib (a.s.) it has been said: "When the wise person knows [something] acts according to it and when acted becomes purified."[36] Now, the possible relationships between knowledge and wisdom are as follows: a person's knowledge and wisdom might be equal to each other and this is what the tradition mentioned referred to; in a second state, knowledge might be more than wisdom and this refers to a person whose actions are under the guidance of only some parts of his or her knowledge; finally, wisdom might be more than knowledge and this refers to one who uses his or her total cognition, including not only knowledge but also speculations, in controlling the actions.

The inclusion of speculations in wisdom shows the expansion and elegance of using wisdom. It is regard to this element that caution appears as a dimension of wisdom. It is not the case that the human holds the capital of knowledge and certainty in all situations. Hence, the importance and vital role of speculations becomes clear in the human's actions. The human is like a mountaineer who sees some paths and cliffs clearly and walks or stands with certainty but sometimes is surrounded by fog. In the latter case, it s not possible to walk with certainty, nevertheless it is still possible to follow some paths and avoid some cliffs by means of speculations.

Speculations, of course, are of two kinds: wise speculations and ignorant speculations[37]. The wise speculation is due to good considerations of the problem concerned with regard to the evidence. The ignorant speculation, however, is made so hastily that if you analyzed it, you will find that it has been nothing more than an illusion turned into a speculation without any support of evidence. Thus, the wise speculation is valuable and a means for emancipation. The Qur'an hence, invites those who have not reached knowledge and certainty to use their wise speculations. It indicates that this amount of investment could be enough for showing the way. For instance, it is asked: "Do not these [people] speculate that they shall be raised again,

for a mighty day."[38] The prophets have declared, with some evidence, that man will be raised to see the results of his actions. One might not be certain about it, but could one deny it with certainty either? Finding this possibility tenable is the result of the wise speculation. If someone does not take this possibility into account and proudly avoid following the way of the prophets, then it could be said that he or she has avoided being wise and embraced ignorance: "And who forsakes the religion of Abraham but he who makes himself a fool…"[39]. Thus, according to the Qur'an, if someone does not control his actions parallel to the passage of the prophets, then he or she could not be considered as wise because he or she has not used the least investment of wisdom, namely speculation.

The result of this section is that using wisdom at the level of cognition means to be in control of the flow of thought in order to reach the cognition or recognition of the matter concerned, and, at the level of actions, it means to be in control of action by means of acquired cognition, including knowledge and speculation. The particular meaning which the Qur'an has given to the word wisdom (aqle) indicates, firstly, that using wisdom is attributed to a person with regard to his or her whole being. In other words, using wisdom is not merely a cognitive matter Hence, even if it could be said that a person has used wisdom at the level of cognition[40], but if the

result of this cognition is not used in preventing him or her from deviation at the level of action, then, on the whole, he or she must be called ignorant and unwise. Secondly, there is a parallel between using wisdom and being led to the truth and good. Wisdom, because of its control and prevention at both levels of cognition and action, can lead man toward God[41] and this could be partly done by the least investment of wisdom namely speculation. Thus, if someone does not achieve the result of this guidance, he or she has failed in using wisdom. Finally, using wisdom has different levels and it is possible to move along these levels to the highest one. In other word, wisdom is capable of increase and decrease. The highest level of wisdom is called 'lubb' (albab pl.) in the Qur'an. 'Lubb' is the purified state in any thing. Wisdom is called 'lubb' when it could move thus in control of every thing in both realms of cognition and action that it could rescue itself from wrong thoughts as well as wrong actions.[42]

Heart

First of all, it must be noted that, in the Qur'an, it is not meant by the word 'heart' the physiological organ, as it is not meant by its near synonym, 'chest', the thorax. Otherwise, it could not be understood that

guidance toward God requires that the person's breast be expanded.[43] This indicated that these words could not and should not refer to bodily organs.

Also, the current meaning of 'heart' as the locus of emotions or intuition does not completely correspond with what is meant by it in the Qur'an. According to the current meaning, 'heart' is opposed to 'reason' or wisdom and, in fact, this struggle between reason and heart has been an ancient one. Regarding what was said in the analysis of wisdom before, the Qur'an does not limit wisdom to the human's intellectual and cognitive dimension. Rather, from a holistic view, it attributes it to the human when he or she has not only established sound knowledge, but also has walked in its light and all this involves being guided toward God. Hence, there remains no struggle between wisdom and heart. It s worth mentioning before going into the discussion of the meaning of heart that the compatibility of wisdom and heart in view of the Qur'an could be well understood by noting the fact that a single person, namely Abraham, is at the same time the symbol of wisdom and love. He is the symbol of wisdom because it is said that whoever forsakes the way of Abraham is a fool (cf. Footnote 39); he is also the symbol of love as he did not hesitate to sacrifice his son for God.[44]

Now, what is meant by the word 'heart' and its synonyms in the Qur'an? a look at the usage of the word in the Qur'an reveals that the scope

considered for it is really expansive, so that all the categories of perception[45], effect and emotion[46], and action[47] are attributed to the heart. This expansive usage shows that the concept of heart could not be limited to one of these cases. In other words, it could not be said that the heart is the locus of perception or the locus of emotions or intuitions or the locus of will. In fact, because all these three are attributed to the heart, it must be considered as the agent of perception and emotion as well as will. On this account, the concept of heart should be considered equal to soul[48] on the ground that the three categories are the main attributes of the human soul. That is why there are similar attributes for heart and soul in the Qur'an. For instance, the soul is called the 'commanding evil' (see Footnote 13) when it has strong inclinations to vices. The heart is also called 'sinful'[49] and this is when the heart embraces sins. Also, the soul is said to be 'at rest' or certain (see Footnote 15) when it leaves sins altogether and relates to God just as the heart is said to be 'at rest' or certain (see Footnote 18) in the same case.

There is a further synonym for heart in the Qur'an, namely 'fuad'. The same broad usage is seen in the case of this word. 'Fuad' is, at the same time, the agent of actions (and intuitions)[50], the focus of emotions and inclinations[51], and the focus of thinking[52]. Regarding this broad usage, devotion of 'fuad' to one of these dimensions is not acceptable usage,

devotion of 'fuad' to one of these dimensions is not acceptable. The same is true about the other synonym of heart, namely 'chest' (sadr). 'Sadr' is sometimes as the focus of emotions[55] and human needs[56]. On the whole, it is clear that the concepts of heart and its synonyms, 'fuad' and 'sadr', are equals to the human soul on the ground that all features of the soul are attributed to them.

Will and Choice

The influential forces are described in the Qur'an in such a way that none of them relates to man in a compulsory way. They include the divine Will without which no motion occurs, angels, devils, governments, social cultures, outstanding personalities, family systems, and inheritance. In what follows, each of these elements will be explained in relation to the human briefly.

First, the relation of divine Will with man is to be considered. Always, appealing to the divine absolute and comprehensive Will has been a way for some to escape the responsibility of accepting the results of ther actions: "Those who are polytheists will say: If Allah had pleased we would not have associated (aught with Him) nor our fathers, nor would we have forbidden (to ourselves) anything…[57] However, accepting the divine

absolute Will does not negate the human will and choice. In other words, accepting the human will does not make the place narrow for the divine Will that requires considering the human out of the realm of the divine Will. What needs to be explained here is how the divine Will includes the human will.

How the divine Will relates to a creature depends upon its existential picture in God's knowledge. For every thing, on order to come into the realm of existence, God considers different stages. These stages are: knowledge, general will, particular will, destiny, and decree.[58] The first stage involves the existential picture of the creature in God's knowledge. In the second stage, God's Will (general and particular) belongs to the existential picture to be created. Then, the role of factors and the amount of materials needed in the case of the creature are determined. Finally, God's decree is issued and the creature appears in the realm of existence. As for the human, first it must be noted that what was his or her existential picture in God's knowledge. This picture was so complicated and different from those of past creatures that the angels erred in estimation about it. They were thinking in terms of the past creatures and, hence, wrongly judged about the characteristics of the human. Regarding the complexity of the existential picture of man, God addressed the angels: "Surely I know what

you do not know."[59] What was considered in this existential picture was, partly, that man has not p pre-determined way in front of him so that he has no choice unless to pass it. Rather, having certain capitals in hand, man can' create the way he or she want' and pass it. And man has shown in history how he creates ways that no creature had previously created, like hypocrisy.

With such an existential picture in God's knowledge, God's Will to create it is suited to the existential picture. In other words, God's Will about the human is that he or she be capable of 'want'. If we distinguish between 'want' and 'the wanted', we should say that it is not lives in it said: Surely we found our fathers on a course, and surely we are followers of their footsteps. (The prophet) said: What! Even if I bring to you a better guide than that on which you found your fathers?..."[63] The influence of outstanding social personalities is also judged in the same way and it has explicitly been stated that the outstanding personalities and imitation of them could not be considered as an excuse for the failures of others: "And they shall say: O our Lord! Surely we obeyed leaders and our great men, so they led us astray from the path."[64] This is stated by them while they are being punished for deviating from the path; this is, their reason is not accepted.

The same point is held in the case of the smaller circle of the society namely, the family system. The place of the human in the family system and the arrangement of the influential forces in it is not pictured in the way that he or she turns to a shadow of these forces. In order to explain this point, some examples are drawn from the Qur'an: the wives of Noah and Lut on the one hand and that of Pharaoh on the other. The examples are chosen of women, perhaps, because there has been a belief to the effect that women are under compulsion in family systems. Noah and Lut were two prophets and their wives who were living beside the locus of God's guidance did not believe in God. Pharaoh, on the other hand, was the locus of disbelief but his wife embraced the faith: "Allah sets forth an example to those who disbelieve the wife of Noah and the wife of Lut: they were both under two of our righteous servants, but they acted treacherously towards them so they availed them naught against Allah… And Allah sets forth and example to those who believe the wife of Pharaoh when she said: My Lord! Build for me a house with Thee in the garden and deliver me from Pharaoh and his doing…"[65]

Finally, the relationship between the human and inheritance should be considered. Could it be claimed that, because of the transmission of inherited characteristics, a predetermined and unavoidable state is provided

to the child? If so, it should be said that the state of an embryo is determined before the birth and his of her prosperity or adversity is predetermined. Whereas, according to the Qur'an, the determination of the final state of a child and his or her human position is dependent on what he or she is given at birth and, then, the diving guidance is given to him or her and her or she is examined in the course of life and thereafter it should be seen whether he or she choose the guidance and acts accordingly or rather goes astray from the path: "Surely We have created human from a small life germ (itself): We mean to try him, so We have made him hearing, sseing."[66] This requires that will and choice is not replaced by inheritance. Thus, the traditions that talk of the human prosperity and adversity at the embryonic stage or talk of a certain inborn disposition ('tynah') are acceptable only when they are not contradictory to the mentioned verses of the Qur'an. The traditions might be held, for instance, to refer to a preliminary and changeable state (or a preliminary divine decree)[67]. In other words, inheritance provides a preliminary state of (non-physiological) characteristics which could be changed by the individual's choice and action. Otherwise, the penalty of a person's misdeeds should be paid by his or her parents from whom they are inherited. Whereas, according to the

Qur'an, "…a father shall not make satisfaction for his son, nor shall the child be the maker of any satisfaction for his father…"[68].

To sum up, the arrangement of influential forces on the human is not so that it leaves no place for human will and choice. To the extent that the human possesses will and choice, he or she is responsible for his or she is responsible for his or her actions.

Collective identity

The human is not described in the Qur'an solely as an individual, a detached and isolated individual; rather, his or her relation with the community within which her or she lives is also considered as a basic feature of his or her identity. As explained before in the analysis of 'Will and Choice', according to the Qur'an, the human is not seen will-less. Nevertheless, it is held that the formation of human identity is basically dependent on the kind of relationship he was with others. On this account, speaking of collective identity does not indicate that there is a 'common sprit', with an autonomous and distinct nature, for every community or society which reincarnates in each one of its members. As usual, in such conceptions, an individual is nothing but a feature of the very common spirit or collective nature, whereas, according to the Qur'an, the individual

can and should reflect on the collective customs according to which he or she lives and reject their nonsense and unreasonable assumptions. Or, if it was not possible, leave that system of collective life and choose another one.

Collective identity is not predetermined, rather the humans make it by means of participating in certain relations to each other. The human has two kinds of action: An action whose direct and observable results do not extend the limits of the individual, and an action which has waves that extends those limits and relate the individual with others and others with him or her. The latter kind of the action is the context in which the collective identity is formed. Thus, whoever is in a community and continually lives in it, he or she has put himself or herself in a certain network of mutual relationships and because of this a collective identity develops in him or her. On this account, the individual must be careful about the people with whom he or she shares because being and continuing to be in a certain social relations indicates that he or she is at the exposure of a collective identity: "…when you hear Allah's verses disbelieved in and mocked at, do not sit with them until they enter into some other discourse; surely then you would be like them…"[69]

Because the human has two kinds of action (individual and social), his or her identity which is the result of his or her actions will have two features which could be termed as individual and social or collective features of identity. This point is held in the Qur'an. An interesting case to consider is the usage of the word 'book' in the Qur'an. This word, when used about the human and his or her actions, indicates human identity. This is because as human identity is the result of his or her actions, 'book' is also the result of actions. It might be the case that what is meant by the book is the human's soul on which the effects of the actions are painted. Having considered the quality of human identity and his or her book, when we study the concept of book in the Qur'an, we find that there are two kinds of book: a book for the individual and a book for the community; the former indicating individual feature of human identity and the latter its collective feature. Thus, on the one hand we read: "And We have made every man's actions to cling to his neck, and We will bring forth to him on the Resurrection Day a book which he will find wide open."[70] On the other hand, it is said that, "And you shall see every community kneeling down; every community shall be called to its book: today you shall be rewarded for what you did."[71]

Where the book is of two kinds, individual and collective, bringing the humans for evaluating their identities at the Resurrection Day will also have two dimension, individual[72] and collective[73]. subsequently, rewarding the humans will also have individual and social dimensions. Thus, it is said in the Qur'an, on the one hand, that, "…no soul earns (evil) but against itself, and no hearer of burden shall bear the burden of another…"[74]. This refers to the individual dimension. But, on the other hand, it is said, "That they may bear their burdens entirely on the day of resurrection and also of the burdens of others whom they lead astray without knowledge…"[75]. This statement indicates the social dimension of the matter. The extra burdens are the result of the humans' social actions and if they were called extra, it would have been so with regard to the individual dimension of the humans. When observed from a social angle, however, these are not extra burdens. Rather, they are the result of collective identity of the individuals, and, in fact, in the final analysis every one bears his or her own burdens.

Regarding the collective identity of the humans, the Resurrection Day is called 'the day of loss' (yaum-al-taqabun) (see Footnote 73). The word 'taqabun' (loss), in Arabic, indicates a loss which has mutual characteristic, that is, it refers to the social dimension.[76] In other words, when the individual's state in the network of social relations becomes lower in

comparison to those of others, the loss has a social dimension. Such a loss is meant in the verse mentioned. This social dimension is not limited to losses, rather, gains of the humans could also have social dimension. The word ‘taqabun’ indicates this aspect as well, even though implicitly; in the balance of social loss, there are lower, as well as higher, states. Regarding these two features of social dimension of the human identity, it is mentioned in the traditions that any on who develops a good or bad custom in the social life, to the extent that it continues to be held in social relations, its effects, good or bad, will return to the person concerned and this is, in fact, a part of the community book.

Therefore, the individual, being in any community, will have a collective feature in his or her identity parallel to his or her position in the community and the kind of his or here relationship with others. This collective feature of identity is a part of the description of human.

Limitation of the human

One part of the description of the human in the Qur’an relates to the limitations that either are actually along with humans or have lurked to catch them at the appropriate moment. The verses that express these limitations seem to blame and reproach the humans. a closer analysis, however, shows that these verses are not always blame-laden, rather they are meant to describe the human. On this account, the description of the human according to the Qur’an will not be complete unless these limitations are also considered. Here, the discussion will mainly be about the classification of the limitations and the characteristics of each class. a more detailed explanation will be given in chapter 5 under the rubric of ‘general characteristics of the human’.

The verses that express limitations of the human could be classified into three categories[77]. The first category includes the limitation which involve the creation of the human. Hence, in this category, limitations are related to how the human is created. Take these example: “…and human is created weak”[78], “Surely human is created of a hasty temperament”[79], “Human is created of haste…”[80].

The second category includes limitations that do not involve the creation of the human, rather they are due to being in certain circumstances. These

limitations could, of course, be seen as rooted in the first category. The point is, however, that the appearance of the second type of limitations is dependent on the factor that the human be in certain circumstances. For instance, when it is said that: "Being greatly grieved when evil afflicts him. And niggardly when good befalls him."[81], the two characteristics of grievance and niggardliness are regarded as those whose appearance is due to being surrounded by difficulties or being at the exposure of gains. It is also the case in the following example: "Nay! Man is most surely inordinate, Because the sees himself free from want."[82] The characteristic of being inordinate is due to seeing oneself free from want which itself occurs, usually, when the person is prosperous.

In the third category, limitations are concerned which are provided by the human's choice. In other words, the human unknowingly creates these limitations for himself or herself by his or her free actions. For instance, mendacity is a limitation for the human which prevents him or her from the truth.[83] Also, trickery, particularly when used against the truth, is a deprivation provided for the human by himself or herself: "And when We make people taste of mercy after an affliction touches them, lo! they devise plans against Our verses. Say: Allah is quicker to plan…"[84]

Of the three categories of limitation, the first one is, according to the Qur'an, by no means a case for reproach of the human. This is because the first type of limitations are departure points for the human and, in fact, such limitations are necessary for the human being on the ground that God has wanted the human to be the conqueror of the summits, rather than being summit-dwellers (like angels). The conquest is the result of a move that beings from the foot of the mountain and if it was not the departure point, the conquest would not have been a conquest at all. Thus, if the human is to become 'strong', than he or she should be 'weak' in the beginning; as her or she should be hasty in the beginning if meekness is required.

The second type of limitation, to the extent that it is due to the first type, is also descriptive and, hence, is not the subject of reproach. This is because, as it was said, departure points are necessary for ascension. However, where these limitations continue and root as a result of the acceptance of initial weaknesses, they are subject to reproach. 'Being weak' is necessary without it being subject to blame, but when it turns to 'remaining weak' it becomes blame-worthy. In the example mentioned for this type of limitation, being grieved in encounter with difficulties as well as being niggardly in prosperity could be natural. However, the acceptance of these states and not trying to be in control of them, is at the scope of

choice and, thence, blame-worthy. a further example is jealousy the appearance of which is unavoidable when the person is confronted with outstanding characteristics in others. However, extending and strengthening it is avoidable and in the scope of choice and, hence, blame-worthy.[85]

The third type of limitations are completely blamed because they are created by the humans themselves. Contrary to the other two types of limitations which were necessary for ascension, this kind of limitation is a barrier for it. Thus, in the Qur'an, in talking of these limitations; reproach is explicitly stated: "Evil is the likeness of the people who took Our verses as mendacious and were unjust to their own souls."[86] The same view is also seen in the case of human's `contention': a person who sees the signs of the truth but does not stop his or her contention, is regarded as the most oppressive person.[87]

A synthetic view

Having analyzed each of the basic Qur'anic concepts about the human, it is time now to have a synthetic and holistic view on them. The synthetic view itself has two parts. First, it is required to determine the inter-relations of the analyzed concepts and thereby make it possible to have a holistic conception of the human. This part will by discussed in what follows under the rubric of 'Face of the human'. The second part deals with the general functions of the holistic and systematic state. General functions of a system is naturally a part of any synthetic view on the ground that they are results of the system as a whole. While it is also possible to speak of particular functions of a system, our discussion will be limited to the general ones because we deal with the description of human in general rather than being concerned with particular groups of the people. The general functions will be discussed in chapter 4 under the rubric of 'General characteristics of the human'. This is because they will be considered as foundations of education on which educational principles and methods will be based. This seems better in order to provide a more clear connection between educational foundations, on the one hand, and educational principles and methods on the other.

Face of the human

What is the relationship among the concepts analyzed previously and, accordingly, what is the whole picture of the human in the Qur'an?

It seems that the concept of 'soul' (nafs) in the widest among all the concepts discussed. This is because, as explained before, 'soul' is the real being of the human and, hence, includes different dimension of the human to which other concepts refer. As far as soul with such a position is concerned, it is necessary, first, to talk about the relationship among 'soul', 'spirit'. This is because these three concepts, at the level of human description, are co-extensive. Even though the concept of spirit, in the first place, is cosmological, at the level of human being, there seems to be no difference between spirit and soul, except that 'soul' is a new name for the portion of the spirit that appears in the body of an embryo and, thereafter, constitutes the real being of a particular individual. On the other hand, the relation between 'soul' and 'heart', as explained before, seems to be a relation between two co-extensive concepts because, in the Qur'an, the main dimensions of soul is attributed to the heart. Thus, the three concepts of soul, spirit and heart, being co-extensive, refer to the real being of the human in terms of which other concepts should be considered. Hereupon,

for referring to the real being of the human, we will mainly use the concept of soul.

Fitrah and the human soul

Now, the relation between soul and 'the divine nature' (fitrah) of the human should be considered. As explained before, the divine nature of the human refers to an inherent knowledge of God as well as an inclination towards Him. Accordingly, the divine nature refers to one dimension of the soul. In other words, the knowledge and inclination is endowed in the soul during its creation, this knowledge and inclination is so kneaded in the soul that it is not possible to isolate it from the soul.

It is not, however, the case that this knowledge and inclination be lively present and active in the human soul. Rather, it becomes active in the soul in the same state that it was first kneaded in the soul: in the first appearance, God makes the human soul completely present in itself so that it has no absence of itself and then asks it to talk about its real being. The soul, Being looked at itself directly and without any veil. Clearly finds that it belongs wholly to God. Thus, it starts to talk of God as its Lord. Having understood this belongingness, the soul finds a deep inclination in itself towards God. Becoming active again occurs in the same manner: whenever

and to what extent the soul becomes present in itself and clears its realm of being of others' invasion, the divine knowledge is a awoken in it and the inclination towards God appears consequently.

Thus, one should not think that the human's inclination towards God is like an automatic engine which continuously works and the human is, consequently, always seeking God. This conception would lead us to say that all humans are seeking God but the mistake in identifying Him. It might be said, for instance, that the human takes money instead of God wrongly or unknowingly. However, this claim is not persuasive. Even if the human is corrected in the case of such a mistake and understands that the money is not and could not be God, he or she might still continue to devote himself or herself to gaining money instead of seeking God. Man's turning away from God is, in fact, a conscious matter: "Most surely man is ungrateful to his Lord. And most surely he is a witness of that."[88] Similarly, seeking God in also conscious. Thus, the divine nature (fitrah) is a rooted divine knowledge and inclination in the should which could be forgotten or awoken.

Wisdom and the human soul

A further relation among the concepts analyzed is between wisdom and soul. Wisdom is also a dimension of the soul which could be considered as the factor of recognition and guidance. Wisdom is the main source of the sol for recognition of the desired aim and abstaining it. Cognition and recognition is only one level of wisdom.

So far as recognition is concerned, wisdom is the distinguishing knowledge of the soul; that is the knowledge that deals always with two sets were of the kind of thought, then they would be referred to by ‘right’ and ‘wrong’ and with regard to this, wisdom is sometimes called theoretical wisdom. As well, if the two sets were of that kind of action, then they would be referred to by ‘good’ and ‘bad’ and with regard to this, wisdom is sometimes called practical wisdom. In other words, wisdom at the level of recognition is a factor that prevents from deviation in judgment between right and wrong, as well as good and bad.

Beyond recognition, however, wisdom is the factor of guidance and achievement of the fight and the good, which is performed by prevention of the soul from following the wrong and the evil. On the whole, the soul is entitled to the attribution of wisdom as both recognition and guidance is

involved in it. Otherwise, if it failed in guidance, even if it achieved recognition, it is not entitled to that attribution.

Will and the human

Another relation concerns the will and choice, on the one hand, and the soul on the other. The will and choice is also to be regarded as a further dimension of the soul by which the human becomes the origin of determination of what he or she wants. Having will and choice, the human soul is far from being in compulsory relations to the forces existing in the world. Accordingly, while the soul is under the influence of the forces. It is not the case that it can not determine or prefer its actions and choices. To understand the will and choice in terms of determination and preference, requires that a distinction be made between will and choice, on the one hand, and inclination on the other. Will is not the same as inclination or strong inclination, even though it is not possible to talk of will without assuming inclination in the first place. In fact, when the element of acceptance or rejection of inclinations is taken into account, the time comes for talking of will and choice. When the person feels an inclination and accepts or rejects to realize it, this approved or disapproved inclination (and in the case of conflict, the preferred inclination) manifests the will.

What has been said so far indicates that without appealing to wisdom at the level of recognition, it is not possible to talk of will. The elements of approval or disapproval show that recognition is performed and this is the trace of wisdom. If a creature lacks wisdom, whether basically or practically, it is not possible to talk of will in it. This is clearly the case in children as well as the adults whose mind is similar to those of children. If social, cultural or family systems treated the individual in such a manner that his or her wisdom would remain 'embryonic', he or she not only could not hold a will against them, but also would be a will-less instrument in their hands. Such people are weak in wisdom and, hence, will is not developed in them. These have no task for resisting against those systems: "Except the weak from among the men and women and children who have not in their power the means nor can they find a way (to escape)."[89] It is said about 'the weak' that they are: "children, and men and women who look like children in wisdom."[90] However, if wisdom at the level of recognition developed in a person so that he or she could and did understand the differences among thoughts and ways of life, then he or she would not be in the realm of those who are weak in wisdom.[91]

When opportunities are available and wisdom unfolds in people, they can recognize their inclinations and are capable of approving or

disapproving them. Here, it is possible to talk of will in these people. Thus, they could resist the oppressive systems or, otherwise, migrate and rescue themselves from the oppression. Even if the migration in the earth[92] was not possible, it would be possible for them to migrate in their hearts[93]; that is, unlike the realm of oppression they lived in, they disagree with what is going on around them: "He who disbelieves in Allah after his having believed, not he who is compelled while his heart is at rest on account of faith, but he who opens (his) breast to disbelief – on these is the wrath of Allah, and they shall have a grievous chastisement."[94]

Finally, it should be noted that wisdom only at the level of recognition is necessary for the appearance of will. At the level of guidance, however, there is no such necessity since, all people's will would belong to the good, whereas the human will is selective and can go in the direction of good or evil.

Collective identity and the human soul

A further relation among the concepts analyzed is between collective identity and the human soul. In the analysis of the collective identity it was mentioned that what is meant by identity is the result of human actions and given that some of these actins are social and collective, the result of these actions constitutes collective identity of the individual. Now, in regard to the relation between collective identity and soul, it should be said that the former is a shape given to the latter as the results of collective actions of the individual. Being in mutual relationship with a group or community, the individual puts his or her soul at the exposure of a certain formation which is suited to the kind of group or community. Thus, while the identity of human soul has a social facet, it is not pre-determined historically, rather it is formed by means of the individual's mutual relation to the community.

In addition, it is not the case that the individual will necessarily find an identity suited to the community in which he or she lives. Rather, given that another facet of the human identity is individual, the formation of the soul's identity is entirely dependent on which kind of community and social relations will be preferred by the individual, on the one hand, and his or her individual actions on the other.

Limitations and the human soul

The final part concerns the relation between the limitations involving human beings and their souls. The limitations analyzed before are as chains on the human soul which should be overcome in order that the soul could transcend.

The first two kinds of limitations, discussed previously, are clear examples of the chains that could provide transcendence of the human, man soul. The first kind, which involves the creation of the human, provides necessary conditions for ascension of the soul. The second type of limitations which appear in different situations are potential chains on the soul which confront it with certain barriers in each circumstance to by overcome.

Even the third type of limitations, namely those the humans themselves create, are, at least at the first instances of their appearance, as backgrounds for the transcendence of the soul. Since are performed by will and choice, but their appearance is a background for activation of the soul's self-accusation and the latter is required for the development of the soul. Sins should be evaluated with regard to their consequences. On this account, sins might be more productive than some good actions with certain characteristics: "The sin that displeases you is better in the view of Allah

than the virtue which makes you proud."[95] This does not indicate that people should be invited to commit sins; committing sins needs no invitation, it rather shows the reasonable role sins could play in the ascension of the soul.

By the way, why did God, having declared that the humans will live on the earth[96], settled Adam and Eve in the garden? It seems that the reason was that they experienced and knew the essential features of their soul: commanding the evil (ammarah), self-blame (lawwamah), and certainty (mutmainnah). Thus, what happened in the garden was that they were first tempted to eat the prohibited fruit, then their evil inclinations became manifest to them and they declared that they were unjust to themselves[97], and finally they received some words from God and turned to Him[98]. Then, they descended to the earth. Feeling guilt (in its normal sense) is built in humans in order for them to rescue themselves from the third kind of limitations.

Conclusion

Having considered the basic concepts about the human and their inter-relations, it is now possible to see the face of human as a whole. The human's real being namely the soul (or spirit or heart), is a battle ground in which and on which different forces and factors are in action: There is an inherent divine knowledge and inclination in it (fetrah) which results in a rest and certain state (nafs-al-mutmainnah); a strong inclination towards what satisfies wants (nafs-al-ammarah); a factor for recognition and guidance (wisdom); a force for self blame in the case of wrong doings (nfs-al-lawwamah); a determinant power for action (will and choice); an influential social force which paves the ground for a kind of identity (collective identity); and weaknesses held in the soul from the beginning or as potentialities which realize in different situations (limitations). This is a really crowded field. Unlike the idea that different forces are in action, according to the Qur'an, the human is not a being who is pulled or pushed by means of certain inner or outer forces. Rather, the final result of this crowded field and the struggle going on in it is the human action. That is to say, this complicated arrangement of the forces does not prevent the human from acting. The very human attempt and action is the important thing in terms of which the whole face of the human should be drawn: "And that

human shall have nothing but what he strives for; And that his striving shall soon be seen."[99] The striving and the resulted actions are what shape the human in the final analysis.

The human striving will lead to two distinguished ways and, thereby, two kinds of human face will appear[100]. In the first face, the human's striving provides a constellation in his or her soul in which evil inclinations (hawa) are dominant, whether the soul's own inclinations or those of others accepted by it; will is the servant, and wisdom and the divine nature are the captives[101]. This is the face of a person who has forgotten himself or herself and is alienated. In this picture, the human is 'possessed' and 'occupied'[102]. It should not be over-looked, nevertheless, that this setting is the result of the human's own actions. The will which is now the servant was, in the first place, the determinant factor of the soul. When the inclinations are accepted and followed by the human, they will, of course, do according to their own logic, namely possess and occupy.

In the second possible face which results from the striving of the human, this constellation is shaped in the soul: Wisdom is the pioneer and, at the same time, harmonious with the divine nature; will is the agent of wisdom; and the captives are the soul's own evil inclinations and those of others being accepted by the soul. Wisdom guides the humans to home; to their

real owner (the Lord). Here, the humans are familiar with themselves as well as with God, this is because familiarity with oneself and with God are accompanied, as are also alienation with oneself and with God.

Footnotes

1. Qadr: 4. “The angels and the spirit descend in it by the permission of their Lord for every affair.”
2. a comparison between the two following verses shows that spirit is the origin of life: 1) Mujadilah: 22: “…these are they into whose hearts He has impressed faith, and whom He has strengthened with a spirit from Him…”;2) Nahl: 97: “Whoever does good whether male or female and he is a believer, We will most certainly make him live a good life…”. Both cases are about the same thing, but what is referred to in the first case as the strengthening of the spirit is stated in the second one as making the person live a happy life. It follows that spirit provides life. (See: Tabatabi, Muhammad Hussain, Almizan fi Tafsir-al-Qur’an, Beirut: Muassisih-al-Alami Lil-matbuat.)
3. Bani-Israel: 85. “And they ask you about the spirit. Say: The spirit is one of the commands of my Lord, and you are not given aught of knowledge but a little.”
4. Hiijr: 29. “So when I have made him complete and breathed into him of My spirit, fall down making obedience to him.”
5. Hijr: 29 (cf. Footnote 4).

6. Qadr: 4 (cf. Footnote 1).

7. Nahl: 97. "Whoever does good whether male or female and he is a believe, We will most certainly make him live a good life, and We will most certainly give them their reward for the best of what they did."

8. Mujadilah: 22. "…these are they into whose hearts He has impressed faith, and whom he has strengthened with an inspiration from Him…"

9. An'äm: 54. "…your Lord has ordained mercy on Himself…"

10. Maidah: 32. "…whoever slays a soul, unless t be for manslaughter he slew mischief in the land, it is as thought he slew all men…"

11. An' äm: 93. "…and the angels shall spread forth their hands: Give up your souls…"

12. So, it could be positive as is seen in Abrahim: 37. "…therefore make the hearts of some people yeran towards them and provide them with fruits…". It could also be negative as is seen in Jasiyah: 23. "Have you then considered him who takes his low desire for his god…".

13. Yusuf: 53. "And I do not declare myself free, most surely (man's) soul is wont to command (him to do) evil…"

14. Qiyamah: 2. "Nay! I swear by the self-accusing soul."

15. Red: 28. "…now surely by Allah's remembrance are the hearts set at rest…"

16. Jasiyah: 23 (mentioned above in 12).

17. Ali-ibn-Abi-Tälib (a.s.) (peace be upon him), Nahj-al-Blaqah, Subhi Salih (ed.), Beirut, Sermon: 191. "They always blame themselves…"

18. Fajr: 27. "O soul that art at rest!"

19. Rüm: 30. "Then set your face upright for religion in the right state – The nature made by Allah in which He has mad men…"

20. A'räf: 172.

21. Baqarah: 138. "(Receive) the baptism of Allah, and who is better than Allah in baptism?..."

22. Anfal: 22. ' "…and know that Allah intervenes between man and his heart…"

23. A'räf: 172.

24. ibid. "They said: Yes! We bear witness. Lest you should say on the day of resurrection: Surely we were heedless of this."

25. cf. Footnote 19.

26. He says that the contrast of ignorance and knowledge was a new usage among Muslims due to the translation of Greek philosophy into the Arabic which led to imposing limitations on the meaning of many

words to become suitable to the philosophical thoughts. According to him, the main meaning of 'jahle' was an action without reflection. Muzaffar, Muhammad Reza, Usau-al-feqh, vol. 3-4, Tehran: Mustafawi Publications, 1386 (1966), pp. 73-74.

27. An'äm: 54.

28. Zumar: 9. (My emphasis). It is also interesting to note that because 'knowledge' and 'ignorance' are not opposite, they could be present in a person at the same time. Consider this example: "Often the ignorance of a learned person ruins him and the knowledge he has does not avail him." (Ali-ibn-Abi-Tälib (a.s.), Nahj-al-Blaqah, Saying: 106.)

29. Hijr: 80-82.

30. Fajr: 5. "Truly in that there is an oath for those who possess understanding."

31. Ta Ha: 54. "…most surely there are signs in this for those endowed with understanding."

32. A'lay Imrän: 65.

33. Ankabüt: 43.

34. Baqarah: 170. "And when it is said to them, Follow what Allah has revealed, they say: Nay! We follow what we found our fathers upon.

What! And though their fathers had no sense at all, nor did they follow the right way."

35. Baqarah: 44. "What! Do you enjoin people to be good and neglect yourselves while you read the Book; have you then no sense?"

36. Ali-ibn-Abi-Tälid (a.s.) (peace be upon him), Qurar-al-Hikam, Abde-al-Wahid-ibn-Tamimi (ed.), vol. 1:101, Tehran: Tehran University Publications.

37. A'lay Imrän: 154. "…they entertained about Allah thoughts of ignorance quite unjustly…"

38. Mutaffefin: 4-5.

39. Baqarah: 130. (My emphasis)

40. Baqarah: 75. "…and a party from among them indeed used to hear the Word of Allah, then altered it after they had understood it, and they know this."

41. Ja'far-ibn-Sadeq, peace be upon him, was asked; 'What is wisdom?', he said: 'What God is prayed by it and the paradise is achieved by it…'. Muhammad Bäqer Majlessi, Bihar-al-anwar, vol. 1, p. 116, Beirut: Muassessih-al-wafa.

42. For the characteristics of this level of wisdom see the Qur'an: Rad: 17-26.

43. An’äm: 125. “Therefore (for) whomsoever Allah intends that He would guide him aright, He expands his breast for Islam, and (for) whomsoever He intends that He should cause him to err, He makes his breast strait and narrow as though he were ascending upwards…”

44. Saffat: 102-107.

45. Bani-Israel: 46. “And We have placed covering on their hearts and a heaviness in their ears lest they understand it…”

46. A’lay Imrän: 159. “…and had you been rough, hard hearted, they would certainly have dispersed from around you…”

47. Baqarah: 225. “…He will call you to account for what your hearts have earned…”

48. See: Almizan fi Tafsri-al-Qur’an, (Baqarh: 225) (cf. Footnote 2)

49. Baqarah: 283. “…his heart is surely sinful…”

50. Najm: 11. “The heart was not untrue in (making him see) what he saw.”

51. Abraham: 37. “…therefore make the heart of some people yearn towards them…”

52. Nahl: 78. “…He gave you hearing and sighn and hearts that you may give thanks.”

53. Adiyat: 10. “Does he not then know when what is in the graves is raised, And what is in the breasts is made apparent?”

54. Bani-Israel: 51. “Or some other creature of those which are too hard (to receive life) in your minds!”

55. A’räf: 43. “And We will remove whatever of ill-feeling is in their breasts…”

56. Hashr: 9. “…and do not find in their hearts a need of what they are given…”

57. An’äm: 148.

58. “…he said: [God] knew and mad [general] will and made [particular] will and determined destiny and decreed and…” in Muhammad al-Sädiq, al-Tuhid, p. 334, Tehran: Maktab-al-Sädiq, 1398 (1978).

59. Baqarah: 30.

60. An’äm: 35.

61. Abraham: 22. “And the Satan shall say after the affair is decided is decided: Surely Allah promised you the promise of truth, and I gave you promises, then failed to keep them to you, and I had no authority over you, except that I called you and you obeyed me, therefore do not blame me but blame yourselves…”. I have used this point from

the following book: Behbudi, Muhammad Bäqir, Compulsion and Choice, Tehran: Miraji Publications.

62. Nisa: 97.

63. Zukhruf: 23.

64. Ahzab: 67.

65. Tahrim: 10-11.

66. Insan: 1-2.

67. See Persian translation of Al-mizan (cf.), vol. 5, pp. 17-19: vol. 25, p. 323.

68. Luqman: 33

69. Nisa: 140.

70. Bani-Israel: 14.

71. Jasiyah: 28.

72. Marium: 95. “And every one of them will come to Him on the day of resurrection alone.”

73. Taqabun: 9. “On the day that He will gather you for the day of gathering, that is the day of loss [and gain]…”

74. An’äm: 164.

75. Nahl: 25.

76. I have taken this point from: Sadr, Muhammad Bäqir, Muqadamat fi al-Tafsir-al-muzui lil-Qur'an, Beirut: Dar-al-tujihy-al-Islami, p. 81.

77. The classification is taken from: Ja'fari, Muhammad Taqi, Insan dar Ufuqi Qur'an, Tehran: Bunyäd Bia'sat.

78. Nisa: 28.

79. Maarij: 19.

80. Anbiya: 37.

81. Maarij: 19.

82. Alaq: 6.

83. Maidah: 75. "…See how we make the verses clear to them, then behold, how they are turned away."

84. Yunus: 21.

85. Falaq: 1;5. "Say: I seek refuge in the Lord… from the evil of the envious when he envies." (my emphasis)

86. A'räf: 172.

87. Kahf: 54-57. "…human is most of all given to contention… and who is more unjust than he…".

88. Adiyat: 6-7.

89. Nisa: 98.

90. Muhammad-ibn-Ali (al-Bäqir, peace be upon him), in al-Käfi: Bab-al-Mustazaf, Muhammad Kulyni Razi (ed.), Tehran: Elmiyah Islamiyah Publications.

91. Ja'far-ibn-Muhammad (al-Sädiq, peace be upon him): "Who knew the differences of the people, then he would not be the weak. ",ibid.

92. Nisa: 97.

93. Nahl: 106.

94. ibid.

95. Ali-ibn-Abi-Tälib (a.s.) (peace be upon him), Nahj-al-Baläqah, Saying: 46. (cf. Footnote 17)

96. Baqarah: 30. "And when your Lord said to the angels, I am going to place in the earth a successor."

97. A'räf: 19-22.

98. Baqarah: 37.

99. Najm: 39-40.

100. Lail: 4. "Your striving is most surely (directed to) various (ends). Then as for him who gives away and guards (against evil), And accepts the best, We will facilitate for him the easy end. And as for him who is niggardly and considers himself free from need (of

Allah), And rejects the best, We will facilitate for him the difficult end."

101. Ali-inb-Abi-Talib (peace be upon him): "…Many a slavish mind is subservient to overpowering longings." Nahj-al-Baläqah, Saying: 207. (cf. Footnote 17)

102. Baqarah: 275. "Those who swallow down usury cannot arise except as one whom Satan ha prostrated by (his) touch does rise…"

Chapter Three

The Concept of Education

The word 'tarbiyah' is widely used to indicate the plan of Islam in shaping the human. In this chapter which is devoted to the analysis of Islamic concepts in relation to education, it will be explained, first, that the word 'tarbiyah' is not adequate to indicate the meaning mentioned, and then an alternative will be suggested by appealing to the analysis of some Qur'anic words. Finally, the analogy of education in the Qur'an will be explained in accordance with the alternative suggestion.

Inadequacy of the word 'tarbiyah'

The root of the word 'tarbiyah' is 'ra-ba-wa'. This root indicates the meaning of enhancement and it is clear in its different deriatives[1]. For instance, instance, in the Arabic, hill is called 'rabwah' indicating its enhancement with regard to the surface of the earth. Also, breathing is called 'rabw' because it makes the chest go up (and down)[2]. Again, usury is called 'riba' because it leads to an enhancement to the main capital.

Thus, the word 'tarbiyah', with regard to its root, means preparation for enhancement and growth and, hence, is used to indicate feeding the baby. However, it is, in addition, used to indicate purification ('tahzyb') which

means so dismiss bad moral characteristics[3]. In this case, it is meant that moral purification leads to an enhancement in spiritual position and, hence purification could be called ‘tarbiyah’.

The concept of ‘tarbiyah’ (from the root ‘ra-ba-wa’) is not used widely in the Qur’an and wherever it is used in the case of human, indicates mainly physical growth, as is clear in this case: “…and say: O my Lord! Have compassion on them [my parents], as they brought me up (when I was) little.”[4]. Here, the word ‘saqlr’ (little) is opposite to ‘kablr’ (big) and this indicates that the concept of ‘tarbiyah’ is used in this verse in the meaning of physical growth. One might say whtat is the importance of a mere physical growth. One might say what is the importance of a mere physical growth for which one must ask the Lord’s compassion for them. The answer is clear; according to the Qur’an, the usual activities of parents in child rearing require respect for them[5] even though they are ‘mushrik’ (associate something with God) and order their children to accept their wrong doctrine[6].

A similar usage of the concept of ‘tarbiyah’ is seen in Pharaoh’s address to Moses: “Did we not bring you up as a child among us…”[7]. What Pharaoh means is that he rescued Moses from death and reared him, rather than indicating education in its wide sense or even moral purification.

Therefore, the word ‘tarbiyah’ with its limited usage and meaning in the Qur’an could not be considered as an equal to Islamic education.

The background of the Islamic concept of education

Unlike the limited usage and meaning of ‘tarbiyah’, there is another root, namely ‘ra-ba-ba’, which is widely used in the Qur’an with a wide scope of meaning. It seems that the Islamic concept of education needs to be sought in the usage of this word.[8]

Now, the meaning of the word ‘ra-ba-ba’ will be explained and then with regard to the related verses in the Qur’an, the concept of education will be analyzed. There are two elements in the meaning of ‘ra-ba-ba’: possession and regulation. Thus, ‘rabb’ means the regulator, possessor. Because of the two elements of the meaning, ‘rabb’ could be used to indicate only one of the two, but when there is no evidence for such a limited meaning, the full meaning is held.

Having considered the meaning of the word, now the question is, what is its position in the Qur’an. Looking at the verses in which the word and its derivatives are used makes it clear that introducing God as ‘rabb’ has had a central position in the efforts of all prophets.

According to the Qur'an, the prophets did not show considerable efforts to indicate that God is the creator. Rather, it is stated that the enemies of the prophets clearly admitted it[9]. They could admit that God is the creator and, at the same time, say that: "The hand of Allah is tied up"[10]. The problem was always in that God be accepted as the 'rabb' (the Lord) of the world and man; namely, as God who operates the world: "…both His hands are spread out…"[11].

The prophets always confronted with a gap between God being the Creator and the Lord. The polytheists admitted that God is the Creator but believed that different lords are in control of the world. In such a world it was possible for Pharaoh to claim that: "…I am our Lord, the most High."[12] The prophets' efforts were to overcome this gap and to show that God as Creator and the Lord are not separable. God's creation is continuous. God is not like a builder who leaves the building when he finishes the work. Regulation could not be taken from God. Rather, only possessor can regulate and the regulator possessor can regulate and the regulator possessor is the Lore. The Lord, in this sense, is the Creator as well. Now, it is clear why the confrontation of the prophets with the governors of their time was inevitable. To accept God as the unique Lord of the world indicates that the governors can not consider themselves as the Lord of

people. Their being the Lord of people requires that there be no one `Lord' but "lords besides Allah"[13].

The central position in the prophets' invitations was to introduce God as the unique Lord. Noah says: "And indeed He has created you through various grades"[14]. Here, God is not considered only as the creator. Rather, His continuous creation is concerned as the important point. Abraham has also devoted his effort to introduce God as the unique Lord. He, along with his people, said that the star or the moon is his Lord but when they set, he said, "…I do not love the setting ones" and that "…If my Lord had not guided me I should certainly be of the erring people"[15]. That is to say, God as the Lord is in continuous relation and guidance to His creatures. In the same manner, Moses talks about the unique Lord. This is a strange concept for Pharaoh who believed in or was familiar with different lords. Thus, he said: "…And what is the Lord of the worlds?" Moses explains that He is the Lord of the west and the east, the Lord of the heavens, the earth and whatever between them.[16] Also, the Messiah invites his people to the unique Lord: "…the messiah said: O Children of Israel! Serve Allah, my Lord and your Lord."[17] The prophet of Islam is also following the same path. Thus addressing the Jews and Christians, he says: "…O followers of the Book! Come to an equitable proposition between us and you that we

shall not serve any but Allah and (that) we shall not associate aught with Him, and (that) some of us shall not take others for lords beside Allah…"[18]

Thus, all the great prophets tried to show that God is the Lord. It could even be said that the main problem of all people, including those who associate others with Allah, was about who deserves to be the Lord: "Surely those who believe and those who are Jews and the Sabians and the Christians and the Magians and those who associate (other with Allah)… These are two adversaries who dispute about their Lord…"[19]. All of these groups could be divided into two branches whose dispute is about the Lord; one including those who believe in the unique Lord and the other including those who associate others with Him[20].

Why is the central position in the prophets' invitation devoted to the Lord? This is because man's main problem lies in choosing among the 'lords'. The first point here is it is inevitable for man to choose a lord. The human might take his or her own desire as the Lord[21] or other people's desires[22] or both. Whatever is taken as the source of regulation for the person's deeds, it will be as his or her Lord. The second point is that when something is taken as the Lord, it begins to shape the person's characteristics according to its own. Thus, there is clear relationship between choosing a lord and a certain kind of actualization for one's

possible states. And this is exactly the point that relates having a lord to education.

A definition for Islamic education

Based on the explanations given in the last section, the basic Qur'anic teachings about the Lord are as follow:

a) Taking lords other than God leads entirely to dissociation in the person's being[23];

b) Whoever is taken as the Lord, he or she will benefit from the person. God is the only exception to this rule[24];

c) The price of taking God as the Lord is to free oneself from being possessed by anything else.

According to these points, the following definition could be suggested for Islamic education. "**To know** God as the unique Lord of the human and the world, to select Him as one's own Lord, **to undertake** His guidance and regulations and to avoid those of others." As the bold words show, the basic elements of this definition are: knowledge, selection and action. Each of these will be explained briefly below.

Knowledge: It is means knowledge that the person understands why only God deserves to be the Lord and why He is the unique Lord of man and the world. This knowledge is the touchstone of being educated. It is not possible to talk about the Islamic education without this knowledge being acquired.

Selection: The knowledge gained is the background for choice. According to this element, education requires the person to choose Him as the Lord: "Surely this is a reminder, then let him, who will take the way to his Lord."[25]

Action: Having known and selected God as the Lord, the person should undertake the guidance of the Lord and act accordingly. To act according to the Lord's guidance is an important element in this definition without which the knowledge and selection could not give their fruits. At the same time, taking the Lord's guidance involves a continuous avoidance of those who proclaim to be the Lord of the person, whether his or her own low desires or those of others. With regard to this negative aspect of the third element, important Islamic concepts such as 'tat'hïr' (to clean) and 'tazkiyah' (to purify) find their proper position in the Islamic concept of education. On the whole, actions of the person are what lead them to acquire good characteristics. Hence, while in some places of the Qur'an

purification is attributed to God and the Prophet[26], in others it is attributed to the person and his or the action: “He will indeed be successful who purifies it [the soul].”[27]

Having considered knowledge, selection and action as the basic elements of education, we will point out that education in this sense does not, is fact, occur during childhood. Rather, this period should be considered as a ‘preparatory period’. Hence, what is involved in it is to prepare the child to enter into the main realm of education properly. That is to say, all what is done in that period must make the child capable of taking knowledge, of selecting and of acting. This could show the importance of that period because without providing the suitable ground for entering into the realm of education, it could not occur properly either. Nevertheless, being educated, according to the Islamic concept, involves the three elements mentioned. Education could not occur without the person having proper knowledge, being capable of choosing the Lord and acting accordingly.

As a result of the process of education in this sense, the person finds characteristics derived from the regulation of the Lord. Hence, the person could be attributed to the Lord because there are signs of the Lord on this different states. That is why two words derived from ‘the Lord’ in the Qur’an to refer to what are called ‘the teacher’ and ‘the student’ in the

current usage. These two words are 'rabbany'[28] and 'ribby'[29] respectively. Both of these words refer to someone who is attributed to the Lord but the attribution is stronger in the first one, namely in the case of the teacher.

The analogy of education

Analogy is a feature of thinking and speaking in which similarity between two things is concerned. In analogy, we attempt to attribute characteristics of a familiar thing to a non-familiar one and, thereby, to know it or make it familiar. The cognitive role of analogy could be seen in, for instance, empirical sciences in which 'simulation' and 'modeling' is pervasively used. Wave motion of light is, for instance, an attempt to know light by means of familiar characteristics of wave. Analogy has also a role in remembering complicated subjects.

Analogy has always been used in educational systems and its main role has been to help remembering. Analogy, both because of using a concise form of expression and being related to sensible thins, is capable of providing permanent pictures in the mind. This role of analogy could be sued in educational systems in two ways. We will refer to them by first order and second order analogy.

In the first order analogy, we use analogy as an educational method in order to provide a desired mental or social change in the individual.

For instance, in order to encourage a person towards humility, we might use an expression like this: “Branches laden with fruits bend down.”

In the second order analogy, however, it is not meant to provide a certain change in the individual. Rather, the point here is what ‘education’ itself looks like. In other words, instead of talking about some components of the educational process, education as a whole is concerned here. Hence, referring to it as second order analogy. It is clear that this type of analogy deals with a concept of education held by a person or a theory. Here, only the second type of analogy is concerned. Following the concept suggested for Islamic education in the previous section, analogies of the second type used in the Qur’an will be explained below.

Second order analogies are always used in educational theories. Using these analogies, theorists of education show the essence of their theories in but one sentence or mental picture. This concise picture provides strong inclinations for educators to evaluate their educational strategy according to its implications.

Two famous analogies of education are ‘making’ and ‘growth’. According to the first analogy, education is like making a chair from wood.

What is presupposed in this analogy is that the educator plays the main role in education. According to the second analogy, namely growth, education is like the growth of a plant. In this analogy, the educator's scope of activity is limited in comparison with the first analogy. What a person will be in the future is rooted in him or her as potentialities. The educator should attempt to be a good gardener and to provide suitable circumstances for the growth of the person. In other words, the human is supposed to have an inclination toward perfection and it is sufficient to remove obstacles from the way.

Having considered these preliminary points, we turn now to the Islamic analogies for education.

The Analogy of education in the Qur'an

Apparently, the two analogies of 'making' and 'growth' are used in the Qur'an in relation to education. However, it will be argued that these analogies, in their usual sense, are not regarded in the Qur'an to be suitable analogies for education.

The analogy of 'making' might be referred in the case about Moses, where God says: "and I cast down upon you love from Me, and that you might be brought up before My eyes."[30] The word 'litusna' in this verse

means, literally, ‘to be made’. However, as its English translation (be brought up) shows, it is not used here to refer to the whole process of education. Rather, it is used with a limited scope to refer only to the physical growth of Moses. That is why the verse continues to express how Moses was brought back to his mother to take care of him. Thus, the implicit analogy of ‘making’ here does not refer to the whole process of education.

On the other hand, some analogies are used in the Qur’an that prevent us from considering the analogy of ‘making’ suitable for education. This is an example: “And recite to them the narrative of him to whom We give Our communications, but he withdraws himself from them, so the Satan overtakes him, so he is of those who go astray. And if We had pleased, We would certainly have exalted him thereby; but he clung to the earth and followed his low desire, so his parable is as the parable of the dog; if you attack him he lolls out his tongue; and if you leave him alone he lolls out his tongue; this is the parable of the people who reject Our communications.”[31]

Where it is said, “if We had pleased, We would certainly have exalted him thereby”, it indicates that the analogy of `making’ is rejected. In other

words, the person should also want to transcend himself, but if “he clung to the earth and follow his low desire”, God will not rescue him.

The analogy of ‘growth’ is also used in the Qur’an. However, it is not used in the usual sense of the analogy to indicate that the human is like a plant with a powerful desire to grow so that suitable circumstances could be sufficient for that. The analogy of growth does not fit together with the Islamic concept of education. Thus, wherever the analogy of growth is used, it is not used in the usual sense. Rather, it is always used with some qualifications to fit the Islamic concept of education.

What qualifications are needed to make the growth metaphor suitable? The Islamic conception of education, explained in the last section, involves certain kinds of thoughts and actions. Thus, the analogy is qualified in a way to include the basic elements, namely thoughts and actions. Hence, a good thought is likened to a good tree: “Have you not considered how Allah sets forth a parable of a good word (being) like a good tree, whose root is firm and whose branches are in heaven, yielding its fruit in every season.”[32] What makes this good tree grow? The good deeds: “To him do ascend the good words; and the good deeds, lift them up.”[33]

When the human thought and action take the central position in education, it is clear that this coin will also have another side, namely bad

thoughts and actions. Thus, the other side of the analogy will run this way: "And the parable of an evil word is as an evil tree pulled up from the earth's surface; it has no stability."[34] This refers to thoughts, but actions too have their own place. Contrary to the first picture in which action was likened to water that makes the tree of thought grow, here not only though is likened to a rootless tree, but also action is likened to a mirage: "their needs are like a mirage in a desert, which the thirsty man deems to be water; until when he comes to it he finds it to be naught."[35].

In addition, because the human's thoughts and actions determine the way to be passed, it could be said that the human is the plant and the gardener at the same time. This kind of expression is also used in the Qur'an's analogies: "The parable of those who spend their property in the way of Allah is as the parable of a grain growing seven ears (with) a hundred grains in every ear."[36] It is said in the interpretation of this verse that by the `parable of grain' is meant `parable of the cultivator of a grain' because the people `who spend their property' are concerned.[37] This analogy is also two-sided. Hence, we read: "The likeness of what they spend in the life of this world is as the likeness of wind in which is interns cold (that) smites the seed produce of people who have done injustice to their souls and destroys it."[38]

Another case of the growth analogy used in the Qur'an is to liken the human to the land: "We send down water on it. And as for the good land, its vegetation springs forth (abundantly) and (as for) that which is inferior (its herbage) comes forth but scantily."[39] Here, also, the analogy is two-sided; good and bad lands. In this analogy, instead of likening the human to a seed which needs good circumstances, the human is principally likened to the land that could be good or inferior. In other words, goodness and badness of the human should be sought in himself or herself instead of the circumstances; it should be sought mainly in his or her thoughts and actions instead of nature and substance.

As the above-mentioned cases of the growth analogy show, the usage of this analogy in the Qur'an is quit different from the usual usage of the analogy. The point is not that the human is like a seed, being full of positive potentials, which needs to be put in suitable circumstances. Rather, the human determines his or her growth by means of his or her thoughts and actions. That is why a two-sided analogy is always needed.

So far it is established that the two famous analogies of 'making' and 'growth' are used either by putting limitations or by making qualifications on them. These are done in order for the analogies to be fitted to the concept of Islamic education.

Finally, a third type of analogy used in the Qur'an will be explained briefly in the end of this section. This analogy is to liken the human to the human. If this was a tautology, it would be a useful one. An example of this type of analogy is this: "And Allah sets forth a parable of two men; one of them is dumb, not able to do anything, and he is a burden to his master; wherever he sends him, he brings no good; can he be held equal with him who enjoins what is just, and he (himself) is on the right path?"[40]

In this analogy, two persons are compared to each other. One is a slave who has neither a voice of his own, nor an ability to gain successfully what he needs. He is weak as well as dependent. The other person is a free man. He is not a burden on others. Rather, he finds the right way by means of his insight. In addition, he invites other to the just manner. The latter person is what an educated person looks like. This analogy indicates that education involves knowledge and insight, choice, action and social responsibility. On the contrary, lack of education involves a low position at the side of wisdom, choice and action that turns the person to a burden which should be carried by others. With regard to the Islamic concept of education suggested before, it is quite clear that this analogy is completely first with that concept. This is an analogy created principally by the Qur'an to

indicate the basic elements of the Islamic concept, namely knowledge, choice and action.

Footnotes

1. See: Almunjid, Beirut: Dar Al-Mashriq Publishers, 1973.

2. Esfahany, Raqib, Mujam Alfaz Al-Qur'an, Beirut: Al-Taqadum Al-Arabi, 1972.

3. See: Almunjid under 'Hazzaba'.

4. Bani-Israel: 24.

5. Ahqaf: 15.

6. Luqman: 15.

7. Shura: 18.

8. The root. 'ra-ba-wa' itself is derived from 'ra-ba-ba' according to a mode of derivation which is called 'bigger derivation' in the Arabic grammar. Also, the roots 'ra-ba-a' (indicating refinement and collection) and 'ra-a-ba' (indicating growth) are also derived from it according to this mode. It might be the case that the meaning of these derivatives are put wrongly under the root 'ra-ba-ba' (Mustafawi, Hassan, Al-tahqiq fi Kalimat Al-Qran Al-Karïm, vol. 4 [under 'rabb'], Tehran: Bungah Tarjumih wa Nashri Kitab).

9. Luqman: 25.

10. Maidah: 64.

11. ibid.

12. Naziat: 24.

13. Baraat: 31.

14. Noah: 14.

15. An'äm: 76-77.

16. Shura: 23-28.

17. Maidah: 72.

18. A'lay Imrän: 64.

19. Haj: 17-19.

20. Tabatabi, Muhammad Hussain, Almizan fi Tafsir-al-Qur'an, Beirut: Muassisih-al-Alami Lil-matbuat.

21. Jasiyah: 23: "Have you then considered him who takes his low desire for his god…"

22. Baqarah: 120: "…And if you follow their desires after the knowledge that has come to you, you shall have no guardian from Allah, nor any helper."

23. Yusuf: 39: "…are sundry lords better of Allah the One, the Supreme?"

24. Shura: 77: "Surly they are enemies to me, but not (so) the Lord of the Worlds."

25. Muzzammil: 19.

26. Maidah: 6 and Baraat: 103.

27. Shams: 9.

28. A'lay Imrän: 79.

29. ibid: 146.

30. Ta Ha: 39.

31. A'räf: 176.

32. Abrahim: 24.

33. Fatir: 10.

34. Abrahim: 25.

35. Nür: 39.

36. See: Hikmat, Ali Asqar, Amsali Qur'an, Bunyad Qur'an Publications, 1361.

37. Baqareh: 261.

38. A'lay Imrän: 117.

39. A'räf: 58.

40. Nahl: 76.

Chapter Four

Aims of Education

Some words and concepts are used in the Qur'an in a way that they refer to desired final states in relation to the human life. What is usually called 'aims of education' should be sought in these words and concept. The most important of them are as follow (there are others which could be included in them): rushd (growth)[1], tat'hlr (general purification)[2], hayat taiyyibah (good life)[3], hidayat (guidance)[4], ibadah (worship)[5], taqwa (piety)[6], qurb (nnearness to God)[7], rizwan (to seek God's pleasure)[8], qist (equity)[9], falah (salvation)[10], tafakkur (reflection)[11], izzah (independence and might of Islamic society)[12], taawun (cooperation)[13], tazkiyah (moral purification)[14], quwwah and nizafah (strength and cleanliness)[15].

A classification of the aims

A closer look at the verses in which the above-mentioned words are used will show that their domains are not alike. This, the similar words and concepts could be classified in terms of their domain. A classification with two large categories is suggested here which will be called 'intermediate aims' final aims' respectively.

Intermediate aims. The first category includes the expressions that refer to one of the human dimensions. Naturally, this category will include some sub-categories each related to one of the human dimensions. There is a horizontal relationship between these subcategories. In other words, these sub-categories are relatively independent of each other. By the 'relative independence' it is meant that the different dimensions cold be considered as separate aspects. This is not, however, an absolute independence. Rather, this independence is a matter of focus. Thus, one dimension may have indications about other dimensions in an implicit way.

From among the above-mentioned expressions, these belong to the first category: Tafakkur (reflection), tazkiyah (moral purification), qist (equity), taawun (cooperation), izzah (independence and might of Islamic society), and quwwah and nizafah (strength and cleanliness). It is clear that each of these expression refers to one of the human dimension: 'Reflection' is related to the intellectual dimension; 'moral purification' is related to moral dimension; 'equity' is related to the economic dimension; 'cooperation' is related to the social dimension; 'independence and might of Islamic society' is related to the political dimension; and finally, 'strength and cleanliness' is related to the bodily dimension of the human. What was

called 'relative independence' could easily be seen among these expressions.

Final aims. Unlike the first category, this category, this one includes the expressions that refer not to just one dimension but to all human dimensions at the same time. There is a vertical relationship between the final aims and the human dimensions or, one could say, intermediate aims. Thus, the position of a final aim is above the intermediate ones. In other words, all the intermediate aims should seek a further and higher aim. The same relationship is between a final aim and the human dimensions. All the activities in different dimensions should be directed toward the final aim.

From among the above-mentioned expressions, the following are final aims: Rushd (growth), hidayah (guidance), tat'hïr (purification), hayat taiyyibah (good life), taqwa (piety), qurb (nearness to God), rizwan (to seek God's pleasure), and ibadah (worship). There expressions refer to the aims of all human dimensions at the same time. This point will be explained more below in the case of each of the final aims.

The all-inclusiveness of final aims

In explaining the final aim words, because of partial or complete similarity between some of them, they will be explained in pairs.

1. Growth and guidance

‘Growth’ (Rushd) is not used in the Qur’an in the meaning of physical growth or development. Rather, it has the same meaning of guidance toward God and that is why it is used as the opposite to error and deviant path (qay)[16].

Growth or guidance refers to the direction and meaning of creation. Thus, no creature is left without guidance from God. In the case of the human, guidance is done in two phases. In the first phase, guidance means ‘showing’ the way. In this kind of guidance, the right path and the deviated one are made known. Hence, this guidance includes the guidance of the prophets as well as the inner and innate guidance of man given by wisdom. In both of them, discrimination between right and wrng beliefs or deeds is involved.

In the second phase, guidance is not limited to ‘showing’ the way. Rather, it involves ‘passing’ of the right way. The guide, in this sense, is not who he merely shows the way. Rather, he leads the person to reach the end. Guidance, in this sense, is the final aim because it is only in this kind of guidance that the human could be saved from ruin [thus, guidance

indicates ‘fauz’ (achievement)[17]] and reach home [thus, guidance involves ‘falah’ (salvation) and ‘salam’ (safety)[18]].

To reach this final aim requires that the first phase of guidance be passed. If the person entered the right way, then the second phase would appear: “And (as for) those who strive hard for Us, We will most certainly guide them in Our ways; and Allah is most surely with the doers of good.”[19]

To say that the guidance is the final aim indicates that its shadow should be on all human dimensions. In other words, the human should strive to follow God’s guidance in all dimensions of life, including physical, intellectual, moral, social, economic and political dimensions. Even though this attempt is not guidance, in the second sense, it is surely its requirement. When the attempt appears from the human side, leading the human to the final stage appears from God’s side.

2. Purification and good life

Purity and uncleanness are two attributes used in relation to the things that indicate inclination or hate toward them. These two kinds of attributes have been known to all peoples in their dealing with different concrete things due to their natural tendencies.

In Islam, the two attributes are sued not only in relation to the things, but also in relation to abstract entities. Thus, all the Islamic teachings, moral principles and behavioral prescriptions are discussed in terms of purity or uncleanness. That is why the belief in the unity of God is known as the great purity[20], as the belief in polytheism is held as the great uncleanness[21]. Purity, in this wide sense that includes beliefs, morality and actins, is a final aim in Islamic education.

This final aim is sometimes called 'good life'. The main characteristic of this life is purity and this includes all dimensions of life. This purity should be sought in all dimensions, namely physical, intellectual, moral, social, economic and political ones. In this sense, this aim becomes a final aim of education.

In the physical dimension, some physical things, like blood and urine, are considered as unclean in Islam. Good or pure life requires that the person's belongings be kept from being polluted by these things. in the

intellectual dimension, polytheism and idolatry are considered unclean and should be avoided. In the moral and social dimensions, dirty temptations, concerning one's own life or those of others, are considered unclean and should be avoided. In the economic and political dimension, breaching equity and oppression are considered unclean and must be avoided. Therefore, good or pure life is also a final aim of education that includes all human dimensions.

3. Piety

The word 'taqwa' (piety) is derived from 'wiqayah' which indicates keeping something from harm. Accordingly, 'taqwa' (piety) refers to a state in which the human is immune from being slipped into guilt or doing wrong[22].

There are different levels for piety. At the lowest level, the person has not the power to keep himself or herself. Thus, as soon as he or she is tempted, he or she overcomes it. At the previous level, the person's control appears after doing the wrong, whereas here, it appears at the level of the thought of doing wrong[24].

Still at a higher level, the scope of control goes beyond doing wrong, whether actually or in thought. At this level, the control is totally on the

side of goodness of actions. In other words, the person is concerned about the quality of his or her actions and tries to examine and reexamine them to be sure that they are done solely for God's sake: "O you who believe! Be careful of (your duty to) Allah, and every one should consider what one has sent on for the morrow, and be careful of (your duty to) Allah; surely Allah is aware of what you do."[25] Here, the order for being careful (piety) has been done twice. The first order refers to controlling oneself from doing wrong whether in action or in thought. Thu second order, however, refers to the third level of piety. Thus, the invitation for considering what is done.

Given that piety has different levels, it should be said that it is more a 'path' than 'final state'. In other words, we must have piety while treading on the path of God and this path should principally be traversed by means of piety. Thus, when we talk about the piety as a final aim, its highest level is meant.

Piety as a final aim should direct all dimensions of life. Doing only for duty and God's sake, rather than for other motives, should be a final state for physical, intellectual, moral, social, economic and political activities. The influence of other kinds of motives will naturally be seen in the lower levels of education. However, this final aim should be a point toward which the person strives.

4. Nearness to God

The other two related final aims are 'qurb' (nearness to God) and 'rizwan' (to seek God's pleasure).

The first point here is 'nearness' is a requirement for the human. God is always near to the human at its highest level.[26] therefore, nearness actually is always there, but the human might be ignorant of it. This leads us to the second point: Nearness is mental rather than physical. The nature of nearness is attention. If the human concentrates on God, then nearness would be available for the human. To be more attentive, the human will be nearer to God. Thus, prayer is called 'the greatest remembrance of God'. The real nature of nearness is attention and the traits and characteristics one acquires by means of it could be considered as its results.

'Rizwan' (to seek God's pleasure) is also related to 'qurb' (nearness). This is because the nature of 'rizwan' (to seek God's pleasure) is also attention; an attention not to God's 'reward', but to His 'pleasure'. Therefore, 'rizwan' is the highest level of nearness. That is why a little amount of it is more valuable than other achievements: "and best of all is Allah's pleasure-that is the grand achievement."[27]

Like other final aims, ‘nearness to God’ and its highest level, ‘rizwan’, should be a final state to be sought in all human dimensions.

5. Worship

The Qur’an states that ‘worship’ (ibadah) is the final aim in the creation of man[28]. This indicates that it could be considered as a final aim for education.

What does it mean to say that worship is a final aim? The appearance of worship includes some bodily states and movements. These, by themselves, could not be the final aim. Then, we must ask of the real essence of worship. According to the Qur’an, the real essence of worship is called ‘ubudiyyah’. This means that one takes God as one’s Lord (‘ubudiyyah’ and ‘rububiyyah’ refer to the same thing from different angles).

To consider God as one’s Lord requires, firstly, the person to know Him and why He deserves to be the Lord. Thus, in the interpretation of ‘to worship Me’ it is said that ‘to know Me’. Furthermore, it requires freedom from whatever and whoever might be taken as the Lord. In this sense, taking God as the Lord (ubudiyyah) is a quite difficult job because it requires the person to free himself or herself from being the slave of anything. Perhaps, because of acquiring the knowledge and gaining the

freedom, sometimes it is said that the human is created to take God’s mercy[29].

Therefore, what is in fact the final aim is taking God as the Lord (ubudiyyah) rather than worship (ibadah) Per Se. taking God as the Lord, as a final aim of education, should direct the human’s activities in different dimensions of life.

Relationships among the final aims

Having considered the different concepts concerning final aims, now it is appropriate to ask about their relationships. The point is that these concepts merely show a conceptual plurality. However, they don not refer to different things. Rather, at most, they refer to different aspects of the same things.

Now, in order to consider their relationships, it seems better to put ‘ubudiyyah’ (taking God as the Lord) at the center because it is explicitly stated as the final aim in the Qur’an. Then, other concepts will be considered as referring to different aspects of it.

‘Ubudiyyah’ (taking God as the Lord) as the final aim of education requires the person to pass o long and complicated process in breaking hegemonies of different things and states. The human, because of the

pressure of natural needs (such as physical, psychological, and something or someone. 'Need', which is natural, turns easily to 'humiliation'. The practice to get out of these possessions and hegemonies is the other side of the coin of taking God as the Lord. This shows how the process of faking God as the Lord would have educational relevance on the ground that such a process involves finding great capacities and a stable personality.

'Ubudiyyah' (taking God as the Lord) as the final aim of education will direct all human dimensions. In the physical dimension, it requires the person to be in control of lusts[30]. In the intellectual dimension, it requires the person to consider knowledge as derived from God and the more he or she acquires knowledge, the more he or she feels the presence of an almighty Being[31]. In the economic dimension, it requires the person to see God as the real owner and to know that only in conformity to divine laws like equity the human can provide a better condition for life[32]. In the social and political dimension, it requires the person to see God as the real source of governing and to avoid exalting himself of herself on others or making mischief[33].

Having considered 'ubudiyyah' (taking God as the Lord) as the final aim of education, we will consider the other final aims as different aspects of it. Thus, if we are concerned about the final result of the human's life in the

desert of the world, then ‘taking God as the Lord’ would be considered as ‘guidance’ and ‘growth’. Again, if the actual effects of ‘taking God as the Lord’ in human life are concerned, then we would talk about ‘good life’ and ‘piety’. Finally, if in addition to the actual effects, motives of an educated person are also concerned, we would talk about ‘nearness to God’ and ‘to seek God’s pleasure’ as indicating, at the same time, motivational aspects of ‘taking God as the Lord’.

A general conclusion

In chapter two, it was concluded that, according to the Qur’an, the main thing that determines the human entity is his or her action. In chapter three, in explaining the concept of education, it was stated that the prophets’ main concern was to show that any person, in fact, chooses a lord and acts according to its guidance and there by determines his or her entity. In addition, their attempt was to show that only God could and should be taken as the Lord and this shows the real nature of Islamic, or rather more generally religious education. In the present chapter, it is concluded that ‘ubudiyyah’ is the final aim of education. Ubudiyyah is the other side of the coin of taking God as the Lord. It is in this way that all the three points,

namely determining the human entity, the nature of education and the final aim of education, match each other.

Footnotes

1. Baqarah: 186: "…so they should answer My call and believe in Me that they may walk in the right way."
2. Maidah: 6: "… He wishes to purify you."
3. Nahl: 97: "…We will most certainly make him live a good life."
4. Fateh: 20: "…and that He may guide you on a right path."
5. Zariat: 56: "…And I have not created the jinn and the human except that they worship me."
6. Baqarah: 187: "…Thus does Allah make clear His communications for people that they may guard (against evil)"
7. Kahf: 24: "…Maybe my Lord will guide me to a neared course to the right than this."
8. Hadid: 27: "…and (as for) monastic life, they innovated it – We did not prescribe it to them-only to seek Allah's pleasure."
9. Hadid: 25: "Certainly We sent Our apostles with clear arguments, and send down with them the Book and the balance that people may conduct themselves with equity."
10. A'räf: 69: "…therefore remember the benefits of Allah, that you may be successful."

11. Hashr: 21: "…and We set forth these parables to people that they may reflect."
12. Maidah: 54: "…then Allah will bring a people, He shall love them and they shall love Him, lowly before the believers, mighty against the unbelievers."
13. Maideah: 2: "…and help one another in goodness and piety, and do not help one anther in sin and aggression."
14. Shams: 9: "…He will indeed be successful who purifies it [the soul]."
15. Qasas: 26: "…surely the best of those that you can employ is the strong man, the faithful one."; Muddassir: 4: "And your garments do clean."
16. Baqarah: 256: "There is no compulsion in religion; truly the right way has become clearly distinct from error."
17. Naba: 31: "Surely for those who guard (against evil) is achievement."
18. Maidah: 16: "With it Allah guides him who will follow His pleasure into the ways of safety."
19. Ankabüt: 69.

20. See: Tabatabi, Muhammad Hossain, Almizan fi Tafsir-al-Qur'an, vol. 2, p. 210, Beirut: Muassisih-al-Alami Lil-matbuat.

21. Baraat: 28: "O you who believe! The idolaters are nothing but unclean."; Luqman: 13: "…most surely polytheism is a grievous iniquity."

22. See: Esfahany, Raqib, Mujam Alfaz Al-Qur'an, Beirut: Al-Taqadum Al-Arabi, 1972.

23. A'lay Imran: 135: "And those who when they commit an indecency or do injustice to their souls remember Allah and ask forgiveness for their faults."

24. A'räf: 201: "Surely those who guard (against evil), when a visitation from the Satan afflicts them they become mindful, then lo! they see."

25. Hashr: 18.

26. Qaf: 16: "…and We are nearer to him than his life-vein."

27. Baraah: 72. The word 'rizwan' is indefinite in this verse. It is said that this indicates scantiness. (See: Ablburhan fi Ulum Al-Qur'an,)

28. Zariat: 56.

29. Hüd: 119: "Except those on whom your Lord has mercy; and for this did He create them."

30. Nissa: 27.

31. Baqarah: 255; Fater: 28.

32. A’lay Imran: 26.

33. Yusuf: 40; Qasas: 83.